



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 30]

नई विल्सी, शनिवार, जुलाई 24, 1976/शावण 2, 1898

No. 30]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 24, 1976/SRAVANA 2, 1898

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह भ्रात्य संकालन के क्षम में रखा जा सके।
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रका मंत्रालय की छोड़कार) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य भेद प्रशासनों की छोड़कार)
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गए सांविधिक आदेश और प्रधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities
(other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

मन्त्रिमंडल सचिवालय
(कार्यालय और प्रशासनिक मुद्धार विभाग)

नई विल्सी, 6 जुलाई, 1976

का० ना० 2691.—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक और अनुच्छेद 148 के खण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, तथा भारतीय नेतृत्वपरीक्षा और नेतृत्व विभाग में सेवा करने वाले अधिकारियों के संबंध में, नियंत्रक और महालेखापरीक्षक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (आचरण) नियम, 1964 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (आचरण) संस्थान नियम, 1976 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. केन्द्रीय नियम सेवा (आचरण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 18 के उपनियम (1) को उस नियम के खण्ड (I) के रूप में पुनः संस्थानित किया जाएगा, और

(क) इस प्रकार तथा पुनः संस्थानित खण्ड (I) में—

(i) आरम्भिक पैरा में, “और तत्पश्चात् ऐसे अन्तराली पर, जो सरकार द्वारा विनिर्दिष्ट किए जाएं” शब्दों का सोप किया जाएगा;

(ii) टिप्पण 3 के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित टिप्पण रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्—

“टिप्पण 3 जहाँ ऐसे सरकारी सेवक को, जो पहले से ही किसी सेवा का है या कोई पद धारण कर रहा है, किसी अन्य सिविल सेवा या पद पर नियुक्त किया जाता है, वहाँ उससे इस खण्ड के अधीन नई विवरणी प्रस्तुत करने की प्रवेशा नहीं की जाएगी।”

(ग) इस प्रकार यथा पुनः संस्थानित खण्ड (I) जिसके अन्तर्गत उसके टिप्पण भी आते हैं के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित खण्ड अन्तः स्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्—

(ii) किसी सेवा का, या समूह के प्रथमा समूह खंड में सम्मिलित कोई पद धारण करने वाला, हर एक सरकारी सेवक ऐसे प्रलूप में जो सरकार द्वारा इस बाबत विहित किया जाए, एक वार्षिक विवरणी प्रस्तुत करेगा जिसमें उस स्थावर सम्पत्ति के बारे में पूर्ण विविडियाँ दी जाएंगी जो उसने विरासत में प्राप्त की हो या उसके स्वामित्व में हो या उसने अर्जित की हो प्रथमा जो उसके द्वारा पट्टे या बंधक पर या तो अपने नाम में या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति के नाम में धारित हो।

[संख्या 11013/19/75-स्थापना(ए)]

प्रार० सी० गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

CABINET SECRETARIAT

(Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

S.O. 2691.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Third Amendment Rules, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force from the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. Sub-rule (1) of rule 18 of the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, shall be re-numbered as clause (i) thereof and—

(a) in clause (i) as so re-numbered,—

(i) in the opening paragraph, the words "and thereafter at such intervals as may be specified by the Government" shall be omitted;

(ii) for Note 3, the following Note shall be substituted, namely:—

"Note 3.—Where a Government servant already belonging to a service or holding a post is appointed to any other civil service or post, he shall not be required to submit a fresh return under this clause";

(b) after clause (i) as so re-numbered (including the Notes thereto), the following clause shall be inserted, namely:—

"(ii) Every Government servant belonging to any service or holding any post included in Group A or group B shall submit an annual return in such form as may be prescribed by the Government in this regard giving full particulars regarding the immovable property inherited by him or owned or acquired by him or held by him on lease or mortgage either in his own name or in the name of any member of his family or in the name of any other person."

[No. 11013/19/75-Ests(A)]

R. C. GUPTA, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और बैंककारी विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 11 जून, 1976

प्राय-कर

का० आ० 2692.—प्राय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री आई० डी० नेभानी और के० एम० शर्मा को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित प्रधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन कर वसूली प्रधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राप्तिकृत करती है।

2. अधिसूचना सं० 1083 (का० सं० 404/103/75 आई० डी० सी० सी०) सारीख 17-9-1975, सं० 416 (का० सं० 404/128/73 आई० डी० सी० सी०) सारीख 9-7-73 और सं० 130 (का० सं० 404/235/72

आई० डी० सी० सी०) तारीख 30-6-72 के अधीन की गई क्रमशः सर्वथ्री वी० के० गुला, पा० पा० गोरिया और एम० एव० मितल की नियुक्ति सर्वथ्री आई० डी० नेभानी और के० एम० शर्मा के कर वसूली प्रधिकारी के रूप में कार्य-भार प्रहृण करने की तारीख से रद्द की जाती है।

3. यह अधिसूचना श्री आई० डी० नेभानी और के० एम० शर्मा के कर वसूली प्रधिकारी के रूप में कार्य-भार प्रहृण करने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 1354 (का० सं० 404/41/76-आई० डी० सी० सी०)]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue and Banking)

New Delhi, the 11th June, 1976

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 2692.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises S/Shri I. D. Nebhani and K. M. Sharma who are Gazetted Officers of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Officers under the said Act.

2. The appointments of S/Shri V. K. Gupta, M. S. Rajoria and N. L. Mittal made in Notification No. 1083 F. No. 404/103/75-ITCC dated 17-9-1975 No. 416 (F. No. 404/128/73-ITCC) dated 9-7-73 and No. 130 (F. No. 404/235/72-ITCC) dated 30-6-72 respectively are cancelled with effect from the date S/Shri I. D. Nebhani and K. M. Sharma take over charge as T.R.Os.

3. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date S/Shri I. D. Nebhani and K. M. Sharma take over charge as T.R.Os.

[No. 1354 (F. No. 404/41/76-ITCC)]

नई दिल्ली, 19 जून, 1976

प्राय-कर

का० आ० 2693.—प्राय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एस० एस० एस० थिंड को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित प्रधिकारी है, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन कर वसूली प्रधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राप्तिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री एस० एस० थिंड के कर वसूली प्रधिकारी के रूप में कार्य-भार प्रहृण करने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 1360 (का० सं० 404/89/76-आई० डी० सी० सी०)]
वी० पी० मितल, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th June, 1976

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 2693.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri S. S. Thind, who is a Gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri S. S. Thind takes over the charge of Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 1360 (F. No. 404/89/76-ITCC)]
V. P. MITTAL, Dy. Secy.

(बैंकिंग वर्ग)

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2694.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि पहली जुलाई, 1976 से प्रारम्भ होकर 30 जून, 1978 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के दौरान —

(क) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) के उपवर्णण (i) और (ii) के उपबन्ध नीचे लिखे बैंकों के मामलों में वहाँ तक सागू नहीं होंगे जहाँ तक कि वे उपबन्ध कथित बैंकों का प्रबन्ध उन व्यक्तियों द्वारा किये जाने का प्रतिषेध करते हैं, जोकि कम्पनी अधिनियम 1956 (1956 का 1) के अधीन एक पंजीकृत कम्पनी “कृषिक वित्त निगम लिं.” के निवेशक हैं; और

(ख) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 की उपधारा (3) के उपबन्ध नीचे लिखे बैंकों के मामलों में वहाँ तक सागू नहीं होंगे जहाँ तक कि वे उपबन्ध उक्त बैंकों के उपर्युक्त “कृषिक वित्त निगम लिं.” के शेयर धारण करने का प्रतिषेध करते हैं।

क्रम सं०	बैंक का नाम
1.	सेट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया
2.	बैंक आफ इंडिया
3.	पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
4.	बैंक आफ बड़ीवा
5.	यूनाइटेड कॉमर्शियल बैंक
6.	यूनाइटेड बैंक आफ इंडिया
7.	यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया
8.	बैंक आफ महाराष्ट्र
9.	सिड्नीकेट बैंक
10.	देना बैंक

[सं० एफ० 13/3/76-ए० सी०]

हृषीकेश गुहा, अवरसचिव

(Banking Wing)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

S.O. 2694.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that, during the period commencing on the 1st July, 1976 and ending with the 30th June, 1978 —

(a) the provisions of sub-clauses (i) and (ii) of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the said Act

shall not apply to the undermentioned banks in so far as the said provisions prohibit the said banks from being managed by persons who are directors of the Agricultural Finance Corporation Ltd., a company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956); and

(b) the provisions of sub-section (3) of section 19 of the said Act shall not apply to the undermentioned banks, in so far as the said provisions prohibit the said banks from holding shares in the said Agricultural Finance Corporation Limited.

Sr. No.	Name of the Bank
1.	Central Bank of India
2.	Bank of India
3.	Punjab National Bank
4.	Bank of Baroda
5.	United Commercial Bank
6.	United Bank of India
7.	Union Bank of India
8.	Bank of Maharashtra
9.	Syndicate Bank
10.	Dena Bank.

[No. F. 13-3/76-AC]

H. K. GUHA, Under Secy.

का० आ० 2695.—भैत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री गणेश चन्द्र कलिता का प्रागृज्योत्तिष्ठ गांगोलिया बैंक, नलबाड़ी का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 6 जुलाई, 1976 से आरंभ होकर 31 दिसम्बर, 1976 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में सिवारित करती है जिसमें श्री गणेश चन्द्र कलिता अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[सं० एफ० 4-79/75 ए० सी० (4)]

सी० आर० विश्वास, उप सचिव

S.O. 2695.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Ganesh Chandra Kalita as the Chairman of the Pragjyotish Gaonlia Bank, Nalbari and specifies the period commencing on the 6th July, 1976 ending with the 31st December, 1976 as the period for which the said Shri Ganesh Chandra Kalita shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 4-79/75-AC (IV)]

C. R. BISWAS, Dy. Secy.

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक
RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 के प्रत्यासरण में जून 1976 के दिनांक 4 को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा
 S.O. 2696.—An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 4th day of June, 1976

इश्यू विभाग

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

देयताएँ	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तिया	रुपये	रुपये
Liabilities	Rs.	Rs.	Assets	Rs.	Rs.
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट			सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :—		
Notes held in the Banking Department	19,81,66,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
संचलन में नोट			(क) भारत में रखा हुआ		
Notes in circulation	7180,54,56,000		(a) Held in India	182,52,51,000	
जारी किये गये कुल नोट			(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
Total notes issued		7200,36,22,000	(b) Held outside India		
			विदेशी प्रतिशूलिया		
			Foreign Securities	371,73,97,000	
			जोड़		
			Total	554,26,48,000	
			रुपये का सिक्का		
			Rupee Coin	10,64,40,000	
			भारत सरकार की रुपया		
			प्रतिशूलिया		
			Government of India Rupee Securities	6635,45,34,000	
			देशी विनियम विल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र		
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		
			कुल आस्तिया		
कुल देयताएँ		7200,36,22,000	Total Assets	7200,36,22,000	
Total Liabilities					

दिनांक 9 जून, 1976

Dated the 9th June, 1976

R. K. HAZARI, Dy. Governor

4 जून, 1976 को भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण
 Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 4th June, 1976

देयताएँ	रुपये	आस्तिया	रुपये
Liabilities	Rs.	Assets	Rs.
चुकाता पूँजी		नोट	
Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	Notes	19,81,66,000
आरक्षित निधि		रुपये का सिक्का	
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	6,38,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		छोटा सिक्का	
(दीर्घकालीन प्रबलंन) निधि		Small Coin	3,24,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	334,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि		(क) देशी	
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	140,00,00,000	(a) Internal	116,05,81,000
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबलंन) निधि		(ख) विदेशी	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	390,00,00,000	(b) External	
		(ग) सरकारी खजाना विल	
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	317,37,19,000
		विदेशी में रखा हुआ बकाया	
		Balances Held Abroad	1221,72,49,000

देयताएँ Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियाँ Assets	रुपये Rs.
जमाराशिया --		निवेश	
Deposits :—		Investments	235,01,64,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और अग्रिम	
(a) Government		Loans and Advances to :—	..
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार		(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	
(ii) Central Government	50,18,39,000	Central Government	
(ii) राज्य सरकारे		(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	
(ii) State Governments	12,39,14,000	State Governments	222,40,78,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अग्रिम --	
(b) Banks		Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) प्रनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक		(i) प्रनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को	892,02,46,000
Scheduled Commercial Banks	677,15,07,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	
(ii) प्रनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक		State Co-operative Banks	125,29,45,000
Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	33,12,53,000		
(iii) गैर प्रनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक		(iii) दूसरों को	42,85,93,000
Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,70,21,000	Others	
(iv) अन्य बैंक		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	
Other Banks		93,98,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम --	
		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	75,77,53,000
		(ii) State Governments	
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	13,03,01,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिवृद्धक बैंकों को	..
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित और विकास निधि को	
		Agricultural Refinance & Development Corporation	113,90,00,000
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिवृद्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश	
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	9,84,79,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम	
		90,86,49,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund
			66,24,62,000
		राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	
Bills Payable		Loans & Advances to State Co-operative Banks	
अन्य देयताएँ		राष्ट्रीय शोधेंगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	
Other Liabilities	897,34,05,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(क) विकास बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development ment Banks	387,02,55,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांड़ी/ रिक्वेष्टरों में निवेश	
		(b) Investment in bonds/obligations issued by the Development Bank	..
		अन्य आस्तियाँ	
		Other Assets	
		रुपये	
Rupees	4658,92,38,000	Rupees	4658,92,38,000

दिनांक 9 जून, 1976

Dated the 9th day of June, 1976

प्रारंभ के ० हजारी, उप गवर्नर

R. K. HAZARI, Dy. Governor

[No. F.10/1/76-B.O.I.]

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में जून, 1976 के दिनांक 11 को समाप्त हुए सम्बाह के लिए लेखा
S.O. 2697.—An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 11th day of June 1976.

इशु विभाग

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट			सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :—		
Notes held in the Banking Department	24,53,79,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
संचलन में नोट	7314,72,68,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ		
Notes in circulation			(a) Held in India	182,52,51,000	
आरो किये गये कुल नोट			(ब) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
			(b) Held outside India		..
Total notes issued	7339,26,47,000		विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां		
			Foreign Securities	471,73,97,000	
			जोड़		
			Total	654,26,48,000	
			रुपये का सिक्का		
			Rupee Coin	9,55,36,000	
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति- भूतियां		
			Government of India Rupee Securities	6 675,44,63,000	
			देशी विनियम बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र		
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
कुल देयताएं Total Liabilities	7339,26,47,000		कुल आस्तियां Total Assets		7339,26,47,000

दिनांक 16 जून, 1976

Dated the 16th day of June, 1976

आर० के० शेषाद्रि, उप गवर्नर

R. K. SESHADRI, Dy. Governor

11 जून, 1976 को भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 11th June, 1976

देयताएं Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियां Assets	रुपये Rs.
चुकता पूँजी Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	नोट	24,53,79,000
प्रारंभित निधि Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Notes रुपये का सिक्का	5,80,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	334,00,00,000	Rupee Coin छोटा सिक्का	2,95,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	140,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :— (क) देशी (ब) विदेशी (c) Government Treasury Bills	130,80,79,000
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	390,00,00,000	(d) सरकारी बजाना बिल Balances Held Abroad	356,57,74,000
			1184,15,23,000

देवताएँ Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियाँ Assets	रुपये Rs.
जमाराशिया :—		निवेश	
Deposits :—		Investments	172,46,26,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और अधिम.—	
(a) Government		Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार Central Government	56,96,36,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को Central Government	
(ii) राज्य सरकारे State Governments	10,06,59,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को State Governments	242,34,09,000
(ख) बैंक (b) Banks		ऋण और अधिम :—	
(i) अनुसूचित शाखिय बैंक Scheduled Commercial Banks	721,46,42,000	(i) अनुसूचित शाखिय बैंकों को Scheduled Commercial Banks	982,51,77,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	28,75,90,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को State Co-operative Banks	115,44,59,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,85,45,000	(iii) दूसरों को Others	43,25,43,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक Other Banks	71,88,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (वीर्धकालीन प्रबर्तन) निधि से ऋण अधिम और निवेश	
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(ग) अन्य (c) Others		(क) ऋण और अधिम.—	
देव बिल Bills Payable		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
प्रत्य देयताएँ Other Liabilities		(i) राज्य सरकारों को State Governments	75,77,52,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को State Co-operative Banks	12,78,88,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिक्षक बैंकों को Central Land Mortgage Banks	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित शार विकास निगम को Agricultural Refinance & Development Corporation	113,90,00,000
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिक्षक बैंकों के डिवेंचरों में निवेश	
	1891,56,83,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	9,82,08,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अधिम	
	91,52,85,000	91,52,85,000 Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
		राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अधिम	
	903,27,23,000	903,27,23,000 Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	63,74,55,000
		राष्ट्रीय श्रौद्धोगिक ऋण (वीर्धकालीन प्रबर्तन) निधि से ऋण, अधिम और निवेश	
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(क) विकास बैंकों को ऋण और अधिम	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	387,02,56,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिवेंचरों में निवेश	
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
		प्रत्य आस्तिया Other Assets	
		809,95,12,000	
रुपये Rupees	4725,19,51,000	रुपये Rupees	4725,19,51,000

दिनांक 16 जून, 1976
Dated the 16th day of June, 1976

आर० के० शेषादि, उप गवर्नर
R. K. Shashadri, Dy. Governor
[No. F/10/1/76—BO. II]
सौ० डम्पू० मीरचनानी, गवर सचिव
C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

भारतीय रिजर्व बँक अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुग्रह में जून 1976 के दिनांक 18 को ममाप्त हुए गताह के लिए लेखा

S.O. 2698.—An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 18th day of June, 1976

इष्ट विभाग
ISSUE DEPARTMENT

देयताएँ Liabilities	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियाँ Assets	रुपये Rs.	रुपये Rs.
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट			सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :—		
Notes held in the Banking Department	35,34,60,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
			(क) भारत में रखा हुआ		
			(a) Held in India	182,52,51,000	
			(ब) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ	..	
सचलन में नोट			विदेशी प्रतिभूतिया		
Notes in circulation	7256,03,54,000		Foreign Securities	546,73,97,000	

जारी किये गये कुल नोट					
Total notes issued	7291,38,14,000				
जोड़					
Total				729,26,48,000	
रुपये का सिक्का					
Rupee Coin				11,67,25,000	
भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति- भूतिया					
Government of India Rupee Securities				6550,44,41,000	
वेशी विनियम बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र					
Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper				..	
कुल देयताएँ Total Liabilities	7291,38,14,000		कुल आस्तियाँ Total Assets		7291,38,14,000

दिनांक 23 जून, 1976
Dated the 23rd day of June, 1976

कौ. आर० पुरी, गवर्नर
K. R. Puri, Governor

18 जून, 1976 को भारतीय रिजर्व बँक के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 18th June, 1976

देयताएँ LIABILITIES	रुपये Rs.	आस्तियाँ ASSETS	रुपये Rs.
चुक्ता पूँजी Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	नोट Notes	35,34,60,000
प्रारक्षित निधि Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin	4,44,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (वीर्यकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	334,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का Small Coin	3,20,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	140,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल Bills Purchased and Discounted :— (क) देशी (ख) विदेशी (ब) विदेशी (ग) मरकारी खजाना बिल	141,82,30,000
राष्ट्रीय वीर्योगिक ऋण (वीर्यकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	390,00,00,000	(c) Government Treasury Bills विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया Balances Held Abroad	329,80,85,000
			1164,26,19,000

देवताएँ LIABILITIES	रुपये Rs.	प्राप्तियां ASSETS	रुपये Rs.
जमागणियां --		निवेश Investments	
Deposits :—		ऋण और अधिम —	156,16,08,000
(क) सरकारी		Loans and Advances to :—	
(a) Government		(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	71,07,40,000	Central Government	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	10,13,39,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	
State Governments		State Governments	252,21,51,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अधिम —	
(b) Banks		Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) अनुमति दाइन्य बैंक	740,54,14,000	(i) अनुमति दाइन्य बैंकों को	1040,90,77,000
Scheduled Commercial Banks		Scheduled Commercial Banks	
(ii) अनुमति राज्य सरकारी बैंक	27,48,40,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारी बैंकों को	127,56,89,000
Scheduled State Co-operative Banks		State Co-operative Banks	
(iii) गैर अनुमति राज्य सरकारी बैंक	1,64,89,000	(iii) दूसरे को	
Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks		Others	42,72,43,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक		गण्डीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबन्धन) निधि में ऋण, अधिम और निवेश	
Other Banks	81,88,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from Na- tional Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(क) अन्य		(क) ऋण और अधिम :—	
(c) Others	1896,82,44,000	(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
रेय बिल		(i) राज्य सरकारें को	75,76,10,000
Bills Payable	93,62,56,000	State Governments	
अन्य देवताएँ		(ii) राज्य सरकारी बैंकों को	12,47,38,000
Other Liabilities	906,74,89,000	Central Land Mortgage Banks	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्बन्धन और विकास निगम को	
		Agricultural Refinance & Development Corporation	113,70,00,000
		(व) केन्द्रीय भूमिकालीक बैंकों के दिवेशरों में निवेश	
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	9,82,08,000
		गण्डीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अधिम	
		93,62,56,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund
		राज्य सरकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अधिम	
		906,74,89,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks
		गण्डीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबन्धन) निधि से ऋण अधिम और निवेश	
		906,74,89,000	Loans Advances and Investments from Na- tional Industrial Credit (Long Term Opera- tions) Fund
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अधिम	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Banks	387,02,56,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा किये गये बांडों/ डिबेंचरों में निवेश	..
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	
		प्रत्य आमिल्यां	
		Other Assets	813,23,10,000
रुपये Rupees	4767,89,99,000	रुपये Rupees	4767,89,99,000

दिनांक 23 जून, 1976

Dated the 23rd day of June, 1976

प्रायकर आयुक्त कार्यालय, पटियाला 11

पटियाला, 1 जुलाई, 1976

(आयकर)

का० प्रा० 2699.—यत्. केन्द्रीय मण्डल की तथा है कि लोक-हिंसा में यह आवश्यक तथा समीचीन है कि 31-3-1976 को नौ मास गे अधिक की अवधि के लिए 25,000 रु० अवधि उससे अधिक कर की अदायगी से चुक करने वाले शक्तियों से सम्बन्धित यहाँ इसके पश्चात् विनिर्दिष्ट नाम तथा अन्य विविधिया प्रकाशित की जाए—

ओर यस आयकर अधिनियम (1961 का 13) की धारा 287 द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों तथा इस नियम उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय मण्डल ने अपने आदेश दिनांक 9 जून, 1969 द्वारा गमी आयकर आयुक्तों का वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के अन में उनके प्रधिकार क्षेत्र के भीतर स्थित करदाताओं से सम्बन्धित नाम, उसे अदा कर चुक की राशि प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राप्तिकल किया है।

यत्. अब केन्द्रीय मण्डल द्वारा दिनांक 9 जून, 1969 के पुर्वोक्त आदेश द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, मैं इससे मलग्न अनुसूची में पुर्वोक्त करदाताओं के नाम तथा अन्य विविधिया दातद्वारा प्रकाशित करता हूँ।

आयकर विभाग, पटियाला

आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 287 के अधीन चुककर्ताओं की सूची जैसी 31-3-1976 की या (i) चुक की ऐसी रकम के लिए है जो नौ मास से अधिक अवधि के लिए है परन्तु एक वर्ष और तीन मास से अधिक अवधि के लिए नहीं है, (ii) चुक की ऐसी रकम के लिए है जो एक वर्ष सीन मास की अवधि के लिए तथा उससे अधिक अवधि के लिए है परन्तु दो मध्य और भीन मास से अधिक अवधि के लिए नहीं है, (iii) चुक की ऐसी रकम के लिए है जो दो वर्ष तीन मास की अवधि के लिए तथा उससे अधिक अवधि के लिए है; और (iv) चुक की कुल रकम के लिए है।

1. मैमज़ भरेकोटना बम सर्विस (प्रा०) नि०, मलेकोटला (iii) 61,118 रु० तथा (iv) 61,314 रु०।
2. मैमज़ प्रवाप गोडवंज पटियाला—(iii) 37,971 रु० तथा (iv) 37,971 रु०।
3. मैमज़ तखाना मोटर ट्रामपोर्ट क० मामाना—(iii) 96,396 रु० तथा (iv) 96,396 रु०।
4. मैमज़ किरजी नाल ओप्रम प्रकाश, करीदाबाद—(i) 1850 रु० (iii) 31,231 रु० तथा (iv) 33,081 रु०।
5. मैमज़ कैलाश जनरल स्टोर, पिंडी—(iii) 48,800 रु० तथा (iv) 48,800 रु०।
6. श्री व्यास देव ईंगरा, मालिक मैमज़ ईंगरा स्टील, करीदाबाद—(iii) 5,84,618 रु० तथा (iv) 5,84,648 रु०।
7. मैमज़ श्री हाऊसशोल्ड पार्स जनरल मिल्ज, सीनीपत—(iii) 1,11,091 रु० तथा (iv) 1,11,691 रु०।
8. मैमज़ व ड्युक वेबर्स (प्रा०) नि०, अम्बाला कैट—(iii) 28,229 रु० तथा (iv) 28,229 रु०।
9. मैमज़ गोहतक डिस्ट्रिक्ट ट्रास्टोर मोमाही, चौहतक—(iii) 26,969 रु० तथा (iv) 26,969 रु०।

10. मैमज़ न्यू राहतक भिवानी ट्रामपोर्ट क०, गोहतक—(iii) 90,519 रु० तथा (iv) 90,519 रु०।
11. भगत जमबन मिह, अम्बाला शहर—(iii) 35,281 रु० तथा (iv) 35,281 रु०।
12. मैमज़ द शुपरीप्र आयल इन्डस्ट्रीज, प्रा० नि० अम्बाला कैट—(iii) 28,930 रु० तथा (iv) 28,930 रु०।
13. मैमज़ मिलरमेन जैन एण्ड सन्ज, गोहतक—(iii) 31,893 रु० (iv) 31,893 रु०।
14. मैमज़ बनवारी नाल बलवत्त गाय, मिरमा—(iii) 97,738 रु० तथा (iv) 97,738 रु०।
15. मैमज़ सत नरगत, हरि कुमार, नालवा, डिस्ट्रिक्ट-भिवानी—(iii) 47,242 रु० तथा (iv) 47,242 रु०।
16. श्री गण० प्रा० टर्निट्या, मार्केन मैमज़ फाइन वायर्ज (प्रा०) नि०, पलवल—(iii) 35,106 रु० तथा (iv) 35,406 रु०।
17. श्री केदारनाथ, सुपुत्र श्री दुर्गमिल, गांव गौद, तहसील-नारनील—(iii) 73,298 रु० तथा (iv) 73,298 रु०।
18. मैमज़ ऋषभमाद तुलसी राम, पहलाव दम नानक चन्द गांव गगड्चाजान, डिस्ट्रिक्ट रिवाडी—(iii) 1,04,731 रु० तथा (iv) 1,04,731 रु०।
19. मैमज़ सूरज भान दुली अन्व, जूलाना—(iii) 42,805 रु० तथा (iv) 42,805 रु०।
20. मैमज़ जरल माइन कैरीज एण्ड क०, चण्डी मन्दिर, डिस्ट्रिक्ट अम्बाला—(iii) 51,817 रु० तथा (iv) 51,817 रु०।
21. श्री इन्द्रजीत सिंह माहनी, 268 एम० टी० सोनीपत—(iii) 60,841 रु० तथा (iv) 60,841 रु०।
22. मैमज़ शमिक मैटल प्रोडक्शन कोम्पारेटिव मामाही, जगाथी—(ii) [13,887 रु०, (iii) 70,910 रु० तथा (iv) 84,797 रु०।

[का० स० मूल्या० II-प्रका०/कर चुककर्ता/76-77/6]

Office of the Commissioner of Income tax, Patiala-II

Patiala-II, the 1st July, 1976

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 2699.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified, relating to persons in default of payment of tax of Rs. 25,000 or more for period exceeding nine months as on 31-3-1976:

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act (43 of 1961) and all other powers enabling them in this behalf the Central Government by its order dated 9th June, 1969 authorised all the Commissioners of Income-tax to publish the names, addresses and the amount of tax in default relating to assessees within their jurisdiction as at the end of financial year 1975-76.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 9th June, 1969, I hereby publish in the schedule, hereto annexed, the names and other particulars of the assessees aforesaid.

Income Tax Department, Patiala

List of defaulters on 31-3-1976 u/s 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (i) for amount in default for periods exceeding nine months but not exceeding one year and three months. (ii) for amount in default for periods of one year and three months and above but not exceeding two years and three months; (iii) for amount in default of two

years and three months and above; and (iv) for total amount in default.

1. M/s. Malerkotla Bus Service (P) Ltd., Malerkotla—(iii) Rs. 61,318 and (iv) Rs. 61,318.
2. M/s. Partap Roadways, Patiala—(iii) 37,971 and (iv) Rs. 37,971.
3. M/s. Narwana Motor Transport Co., Samana—(iii) Rs. 96,396 and (iv) Rs. 96,396.
4. M/s. Chiranjit Lal Om Parkash, Faridabad—(i) Rs. 1,850, (iii) Rs. 31,231 and (iv) Rs. 33,081.
5. M/s. Kailash General Store, Bhiwani—(ii) Rs. 48,800 and (iv) Rs. 48,800.
6. Shri Beas Dev Dogra, Prop. M/s. Dogra Steel, Faridabad—(ii) Rs. 5,84,648 and (iv) Rs. 5,84,648.
7. M/s. The Household & General Mills, Sonepat—(iii) 1,11,091 and (iv) Rs. 1,11,091.
8. M/s. The Duke Brothers (P) Ltd., Ambala Cantt—(iii) Rs. 28,229 and (iv) Rs. 28,229.
9. M/s. Rohtak District Transport Society, Rohtak—(iii) Rs. 26,968 and (iv) Rs. 26,968.
10. M/s. New Rohtak Bhiwani Transport Co, Rohtak—(iii) Rs. 90,519 and (iv) Rs. 90,519.
11. Bhagat Jaswant Singh, Ambala City—(iii) Rs. 35,281 and (iv) Rs. 35,281.
12. M/s. The Kuldip Oil Industries, (P) Ltd., Ambala Cantt—(iii) Rs. 28,930 and (iv) Rs. 28,930.
13. M/s. Metersain Jain & Sons, Rohtak—(iii) Rs. 31,893 and (iv) Rs. 31,893.
14. M/s. Banwati Lal Balwant Rai, Sisra—(iii) Rs. 97,738 and (iv) Rs. 97,738.
15. M/s. Sat Narain, Hari Kumar, Nalwa, Distt. Bhiwani—(iii) Rs. 47,242 and (iv) Rs. 47,242.
16. Shri L. R. Twetia, c/o M/s. Fine Wires (P) Ltd., Palwal—(iii) Rs. 35,406 and (iv) Rs. 35,406.
17. Shri Kidar Nath, s/o Shri Durga Mal, Village Goad, Tehsil Narnaul—(iii) Rs. 73,298 and (iv) Rs. 73,298.
18. M/s. Har Prashad Tulsi Ram, Pehlaj Dutt Nanak Chand, Village Gangaichajat, District Rewari—(iii) Rs. 1,04,731 and (iv) Rs. 1,04,731.
19. M/s. Suraj Bhan Duli Chand, Julana—(iii) Rs. 42,805 and (iv) Rs. 42,805.
20. M/s. General Mines Quarries and Co., Chandi Mandi, Distt Ambala—(iii) Rs. 51,817 and (iv) Rs. 51,817.
21. Shri Inderjit Singh Sahney, 268 M.T., Sonepat—(iii) Rs. 60,841 and (iv) Rs. 60,841.
22. M/s. Sharmik Metal Production Cooperative Society, Jagadbri—(ii) Rs. 13,887, (iii) Rs. 70,910 and (iv) Rs. 84,797.

H. No. HQ II/ Pub/ Fax defaulters/76-77/6]

(प्रत्यक्ष)

का० आ० 2700--केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में यह आवधक तथा सभीचीत है कि विनीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान यहाँ इसके पालन विनियोग में सभी करदाताओं के,

(1) जो व्यष्टि अथवा हिन्दू अविभक्त कुटुम्ब है, जिनकी आय एक लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है, तथा

(ii) जो फर्मे कम्पनिया, अथवा अन्य अर्कन-समग्र है, जिनकी आय वस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है, तथा उनसे मम्बन्धित अन्य विनियोग प्रकाशित की जाए,

और यह आयकर अधिनियम (1961 का 13) की धारा 287 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों तथा इस तिमित उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने आदेश दिनांक ३ जुलाई, 1974 के दारा सभी आयकर अधिकारों को, क्रितीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान उनके अधिकार अंतर के शीतर मिथ्या करदाताओं में मम्बन्धित नाम, पने, हैमियत संथा कर निर्धारण वर्ष सभा तोमे करदाताओं द्वारा विवरणित आय, निर्धारित आय, देय वर तथा दिए गए वर को प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राप्तिकृत किया है।

यह अब केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा दिनांक ५ जुलाई, 1974 के पूर्वोक्त आदेश द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं इससे मनस्त्रुती में उपर्युक्त अव्याप्ताताओं के नाम तथा अन्य विनियोग पत्रिकाएँ प्रकाशित करना है।

आयकर विभाग, पटियाला।

मैंसे सभी अर्कन्यों तथा हिन्दू अविभक्त कुटुम्बों के नाम जिनकी आय विनीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान एक लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है तथा सभी फर्मों, अर्कन्य समग्र तथा कम्पनियों के नाम जिनकी आय वस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है।

- (1) हैमियत के लिए है—‘आई’ अविभक्त के लिए, ‘मी’ कम्पनी के लिए
- (ii) कर निर्धारण वर्ष के लिए,
- (iii) दी गई आय विवरणी के लिए,
- (iv) निर्धारित आय के लिए,
- (v) दिए जाने वाले कर के लिए,
- (vi) दिए गए कर के लिए है।

1. श्री विमल नाथ, पानीपत (i) ‘आई’ (ii) 1974-75 (iii) 112,427 रु (iv) 1,16,040 रु (v) 76,731 रु तथा (vi) 76,731 रु।

2. श्री दीपक राज नाथ, मार्फत मैमर्ज राज मुलन मिल, पानीपत—(i) ‘आई’ (ii) 1974-75 (iii) 1,81,090 रु (iv) 1,87,930 रु (v) 1,40,696 रु तथा (vi) 1,31,100 रु।

3. श्री डॉ. डॉ. पुरी, मार्फत मैमर्ज गरम्बती इन्डस्ट्रियल मिल्कीफेट, यमुनानगर—(i) ‘आई’ (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 1,56,150 रु (iv) 1,78,030, (v) 1,09,525 रु तथा (vi) 1,09,525 रु।

4. श्रीमती भगवनी देवी, गंगरीवाला—(i) ‘आई’ (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 1,59,680 रु (iv) 1,84,490 रु (v) 1,06,857 रु तथा (vi) 1,06,857 रु।

5. श्री नन्द लाल गुररोताला, मिरस—(i) ‘आई’ (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 1,03,630 रु (iv) 1,10,221 रु (v) 63,386 रु तथा (vi) 63,386 रु।

6. मैगज यमुना मिल्कीफेट विं, यमुनानगर—(i) ‘मी’ (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 18,85,740 रु (iv) 18,88,280 रु (v) 10,90,482 रु तथा (vi) 10,90,482 रु।

7. मैगज अथवा मैटल थक्स, (प्रा०) विं, रिवाई—(i) ‘मी’ (ii) 1975-76 (iii) 8,82,750 रु (iv) 10,34,665 रु (v) 6,11,696 रु तथा (vi) 6,21,340 रु।

[का० स० म० II प्रका०/आ० क०/76-77/2]

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 2700.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified relating to assessee:

- (i) being individual, or Hindu undivided families, who have been assessed on an income of more than one lakh of rupees, and
- (ii) being firms, companies, or other association of persons, who have been assessed on an income of more than ten lakhs of rupees,

during the financial year 1975-76.

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act (43 of 1961) and all other powers enabling them in this behalf, the Central Govt. has by its order dated 5th July, 1975, authorised all Commissioners of Income-tax to publish the names, addresses, status and assessment year, relating to assessee within their jurisdiction and the income returned by, the income assessed on, the tax payable by, and the tax paid by, such assessee during the financial year 1975-76;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 5th July, 1974, I hereby publish in the schedule, hereto annexed the names and other particulars of the assessee aforesaid

Income Tax Department, Patiala

Names of all individuals and Hindu Undivided families assessed on an income of more than Rs. one lakh and of all firms, Association of persons and companies assessed on an income of more than Rs. ten lakhs during the financial year 1975-76: (i) for Status—'I' for individual, 'C' for company; (ii) for assessment year; (iii) for income returned; (iv) for income assessed; (v) for tax payable and (vi) for tax paid.

1. Shri Vimal Nath, Panipat (i) 'I', (ii) 1974-75, (iii) Rs. 1,12,417, (iv) Rs. 1,16,040, (v) Rs. 76,731 and (vi) Rs. 76,731.
2. Shri Deepak Raj Nath c/o M/s. Raj Woollen Mills, Panipat—(i) 'I', (ii) 1974-75, (iii) Rs. 1,81,090, (iv) Rs. 1,87,930, (v) Rs. 1,40,696 and (vi) Rs. 1,34,400.
3. Shri D. D. Puri, c/o M/s. Saraswati Industrial Syndicate, Yamunanagar—(i) 'I', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 1,56,150, (iv) Rs. 1,78,030, (v) Rs. 1,09,525 and (vi) Rs. 1,09,525.
4. Smt. Bhagwati Devi, Ganeriwala—(i) 'I', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 1,59,680, (iv) Rs. 1,84,490, (v) Rs. 1,06,857 and (vi) Rs. 1,06,857.
5. Shri Nand Lal Ganeriwala, Sirsa—(i) 'I', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 1,03,630, (iv) Rs. 1,10,221, (v) Rs. 63,386 and (vi) Rs. 63,386.
6. M/s. Yamuna Syndicate Ltd., Yamunanagar—(i) 'C', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 18,85,740, (iv) Rs. 18,88,280, (v) Rs. 10,90,482 and (vi) Rs. 10,90,482.
7. M/s. Aggarwal Metal Works, (P) Ltd., Rewari—(i) 'C', (ii) 1975-76, (iii) Rs. 8,82,750, (iv) Rs. 10,39,665, (v) Rs. 6,44,696 and (vi) Rs. 6,21,340.

[F. No. HQ II/Pub/I. Tax/76-77/7]

(धनकर)

का० २७०१।—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में यह भावर्यक तथा सर्वानुरूप है कि धनकर अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 27) के प्रशील वहाँ हम के पश्चात् विभिन्न तर्जे के करवाताप्ती के नाम तथा अन्य विभिन्न प्रकाशित की जाएं, जिनका शुद्ध धन विस्तीर्ण वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान 10 लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित किया गया धन, तथा वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान देय धनकर तथा दिए गए धनकर का प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राप्तिकृत किया है।

प्रीर यस धनकर अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 27) की धारा 42-के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का तथा इस निमित्त उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार में अपने आदेश दिनांक 7 जनवरी, 1975 के द्वारा धनकर के सभी आयुक्तों को अपने अधिकार में स्थित करवाताप्ती से सम्बंधित नाम, पर्याय, वैसियत तथा निर्धारण वर्ष तथा ऐसे करवाताप्ती द्वारा विवरणित धन, निर्धारित किया गया धन, तथा वित्तीय वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान देय धनकर तथा दिए गए धनकर का प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राप्तिकृत किया है।

अतः धनकर केन्द्रीय सरकार के उपर्युक्त दिनांक 7 जनवरी, 1975 के भावेश के प्रत्युत्तर प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं एतद्वारा इसमें यसके प्रत्युत्तर से अपर्युक्त करवाताप्ती के नाम तथा विभिन्न प्रकाशित करता हूँ।

प्रायकर विभाग

धन कर के ऐसे सभी करवाताप्ती के नाम, जिनका शुद्ध धन विस्तीर्ण वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान 10 लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित किया गया था: (i) हैमियत के लिए है—'एच' (H) हिन्दू प्रविभक्त कुटुम्ब के लिए, (ii) करतिधारण वर्ष के लिए (iii) दी गई शुद्ध धन विवरणी (रिट्ने) के लिए, (iv) निर्धारित शुद्ध धन के लिए (v) देय कर के लिए (vi) दिए गए कर के लिए है।

1. श्री पी० के० चौधरी, मालिक रमेश लक्ष्मी काटन जिल्हा विधायक वर्ष 1975-76 के दौरान 10,78,310 रु० (iv) 10,83,300 रु० (v) 41,914 रु० (vi) 41,914 रु०

[फा० सा० सुच्चा० II/प्रका०/धनकर/76-77/5]

श्री० पी० गुप्ता, धनकर शायुक्त

Wealth-tax

S.O. 2701.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified relating to assessee who have been assessed under the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957) on net wealth exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs during the financial year 1975-76.

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 42A of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957 (27 of 1957) and all other powers enabling them in this behalf the Central Government has by its Order dated 7th January, 1975 authorised all Commissioners of Wealth-tax to publish the names, addresses, status and assessment year relating to assessee within their jurisdiction and wealth returned by, the wealth assessed on, the wealth-tax payable by and the wealth-tax paid by such assessee during the financial year 1975-76.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 7th January 1975, I hereby publish in Schedule, hereto annexed,

the names and other particulars of the assessee aforesaid.

Income-tax Department

Names of all Wealth-tax assessee assessed on net wealth exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs during the financial year '75-76 (i) stands for status—'H' for H.U.F., (ii) for assessment year; (iii) for net wealth returned; (iv) for net wealth assessed (v) for tax payable and (vi) for tax paid.

1. Shri P. K. Choudhary, Prop. M/s Laxmi Cotton Ginning & Oil Mills, Hissar (i) 'H' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) Rs. 10,78,310 (iv) Rs. 10,83,300 (v) Rs. 41,914 (vi) Rs. 41,914.

[F. No. HQ II/Pub/W Tax/76-77/5]

V. P. GUPTA, Commissioner of Wealth tax

उच्चोग और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

(भारी उच्चोग विभाग)

प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2702.—विकास परिषद् (प्रक्रिया सम्बंधी) नियम 1952 के नियम 2, 4 और 5 के साथ पठित, उच्चोग (विकास और विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 65) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय मरकार पोत निर्माण, पोत मरम्मत और पोत के आनुषंगिक पुजों के उत्पादन में से लगे हुए, अनुसूचित उच्चोगों के लिए एक विकास परिषद् गठित करती है।

2 उक्त विकास परिषद् में निम्नलिखित मादस्य होंगे जिनकी नियुक्ति की अवधि हम आदेश की तारीख से 2 वर्ष के लिए होगी—

पोत निर्माण, पोत मरम्मत और पोत के आनुषंगिक पुजों के उत्पादन में से लगे हुए अनुसूचित उच्चोगों के लिए विकास परिषद्

अध्यक्ष

- श्री एच० पी० नन्दा,
एम्कानेम लिमिटेड,
११, मिथिया हाउस
नई दिल्ली।

सदस्य

- श्री एम० एम० घोष
संयुक्त सचिव,
भारी उच्चोग विभाग,
नई दिल्ली।
- श्री एम० के० भट्टनागर,
संयुक्त सचिव,
रक्षा उत्पादन विभाग
रक्षा मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली
- श्री एम० पी० गान्धुरक्षाण्यम्
संयुक्त सचिव, (मास्यकी)
कृषि विभाग,
कृषि और मिथाई मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली
- श्री एम० एम० गिल,
गव्यक सचिव, (पात प्रापण)
नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय,
नई दिल्ली

- ब्रिगेडियर एम० पी० नन्दा,
विकास सलाहकार (पन्न)
नीथहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय
नई दिल्ली

- भारत मरकार का समुद्री सभाद्वारा
नौवहन महानिवेशालय,
नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय,
मुम्बई

- भारत गरकार वा मुख्य सचिवका
नौवहन महानिवेशालय,
नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय,
मुम्बई

9. नीसेना डिजाइन निदेशक,
नीसेना मुख्यालय,
नई दिल्ली

10. रियर एडमिरल के० आर० आर्ड० गमनाथ,
अध्यक्ष और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,
हिन्दुस्तान शिपिंग लिमिटेड,
विश्वाश्रापननम्

11. आइस एडमिरल एन० कृष्णन्,
अध्यक्ष और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,
कोलीन सिप यार्ड लिमिटेड,
कोलीन

12. रियर एडमिरल कृष्ण देव,
अध्यक्ष और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,
गार्डन रीच, वर्क शाप्स, लिमिटेड
कलकत्ता

13. ग्रियर एडमिरल ह० सी० कुरुविला
अध्यक्ष और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,
मस्साव डाक लिमिटेड,
मुम्बई

14. कपाहर के० चेन्निया,
अध्यक्ष, केन्द्रीय अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जलपरिवहन निगम,
कलकत्ता

15. कैटन एम० प्रभाल,
उष महा प्रबन्धक,
भारत इंडोनिशियन लिमिटेड,
बगलौर

16. श्री जे० आर० द्विवेदी,
महा प्रबन्धक,
गिरिया वर्क शाप लिमिटेड,
मुम्बई

17. श्री ऊर्जी कृष्णन्,
भारताधिक निदेशक,
बिश्वी इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स लिमिटेड,
मद्रासा

18. ब्रिगेडियर एम० पी० भट्टाचार्य,
महाप्रबन्धक, सलकोया एक्स०,
हार्टी इंजीनियरिंग, कामानो, १२ मिग्न शेइ,
कलकत्ता

19. एडमिरल एम० एम० नन्दा,
अध्यक्ष, और प्रबन्ध निदेशक,
जिपिंग कार्पोरेशन प्राफ इंडिया लिमिटेड
मुम्बई

20. श्री डी० एम० शी० स्टोरे,
ग्रेट ईंग्लैंड निपिंग कम्पनी लिमिटेड,
मकोटाइल थैंक विल्डिंग,
६०१ एन० शी० रोड,
मुम्बई

21. श्री आर० जी० भाटे,
इंजीनियर प्रबन्धक,
एम्पायर लिमिटेड न शेइगेन कम्पना,
मुम्बई

22. श्री एस० एस० मराठे,
मणिक इजीनियरिंग, कार्पोरेशन,
मराठे उद्योग भवन,
मुम्बई

2.3 श्री जे० सी० नागेया,
निदेशक, गीता इजीनियरी वर्कर्स प्रा० लि०,
मुम्बई

2.4 श्री एस० के० मित्ता,
प्रबन्धक, दाव मशीनरी खण्ड,
गांडन रोड वक्तव्याप, निशिटे,
कलकत्ता

2.5 श्री एस० एस० देशीवाला,
प्रध्यक्ष,
पोत निर्माण, मरम्मत और अनुषंगी खण्ड
इडियन इजीनियरिंग एसोसिएशन,
नई दिल्ली

2.6 मुंश्य कार्यपालक,
सेंट्रल मैट्रिक डिजाइन एन्ड रिसर्च थारेनाइजेशन,
(जब गठित किया जाए)

2.7. श्रीओगिक मलाईकार (एक एस० ई०),
तकनीकी विकास महानिदेशालय,
नई दिल्ली

2.8. श्री गोर गोस्वामी,
सदस्य, ए० आई० टी० य०० सी० की साधारण परिषद
जे०/१७०-ए, पश्चिमपुर रोड,
कलकत्ता

2.9 श्री ज्यामाप्रसाद चौधरी,
महाप्रचिव्र, जी० आर० डब्ल्यु वर्क्स एप्पलैंड
पी०-१३२, मुंशिएली रोड, गांडन रीच,
कलकत्ता- २४

3.0 श्री भरीष चन्द्र,
विकास अधिकारी,
तकनीकी विकास महानिदेशालय,
उद्योग भवन,
नई दिल्ली

२. विकास परिषद् के कार्य यहां होंगे जो श्रीमं
जिनियमन) अधिनियम, १९५१ (१९५१ का ६५) का
वर्णित है।

[फा० मा० १६-१३/७६-एच एम २]

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Department of Heavy Industry)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 1976

S.O. 2702.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act,

1951 (65 of 1951), read with rules 2, 4 and 5 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby establishes a Development Council for the Scheduled Industries Engaged in Ship building, Ship Repairs, and Production of Ship Ancillaries.

2. The said Development Council shall consist of the following members whose tenure of appointment will be for a period of 2 years with effect from the date of this Order:-

Development Council for Scheduled Industries Engaged
in Ship building, Ship Repairs and Production of
Ship Ancillaries.

1. Chairman,
Shri H. P. Nanda,
Escorts Limited,
11, Scindia House, New Delhi.

Members

2. Shri S. M. Ghosh,
Joint Secretary,
Department of Heavy Industry,
New Delhi.
3. Shri S. K. Bhatnagar, Joint Secretary,
Department of Defence Production,
Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.
4. Shri S. P. Balasubramaniam,
Joint Secretary (Fisheries),
Department of Agriculture,
Ministry of Irrigation and Agriculture,
New Delhi.
5. Shri S. S. Gill,
Joint Secretary (Shipyards),
Ministry of Shipping and Transport,
New Delhi.
6. Brig. O. P. Narula,
Development Adviser (Ports),
Ministry of Shipping and Transport, New Delhi.
7. Nautical Adviser to the Government of India,
Directorate General of Shipping,
Ministry of Shipping and Transport,
Bombay.
8. Chief Surveyor to the Government of India,
Directorate General of Shipping,
(Ministry of Shipping and Transport),
Bombay.
9. Director of Naval Designs,
Naval Headquarters, New Delhi.
10. Rear Admiral K. R. J. Ramnath,
Chairman and Managing Director,
Hindustan Shipyard Limited,
Visakhapatnam.
11. Vice Admiral N. Krishnan,
Chairman and Managing Director,
Cochin Shipyard Limited,
Cochin.
12. Rear Admiral Krishan Dev,
Chairman and Managing Director,
Garden Reach Workshops Ltd.,
Calcutta.
13. Rear Admiral E. C. Kuruvilla,
Chairman and Managing Director,
Mazagaon Dock Ltd. Bombay.
14. Commander K. Chelliah,
Chairman, Central Inland Water Transport Corp.,
Calcutta.
15. Capt. S. Prabhala, Dy. General Manager,
Bharat Electronics Ltd., Bangalore.
16. Shri J. R. Trivedi, General Manager,
Scindia Workshops Limited, Bombay

17. Shri Unnikrishnan, Director-in-Charge, Binny's Engineering Works Limited, Madras
18. Brig. S. P. Bhattacharya, General Manager Salkia Unit, Hooghly Docking and Engg. Co., 12-Mission Row, Calcutta.
19. Admiral S. M. Nanda, Chairman and Managing Director, Shipping Corporation of India Ltd., Bombay.
20. Shri D. H. C. Storey, Great Eastern Shipping Co Ltd., Mercantile Bank Building, 60, N. G. Road, Bombay.
21. Shri R. G. Sathaye, Engineer Superintendent, The Scindia Steam Navigation Co., Bombay.
22. Shri S. S. Marathe, Sachin Engineering Corporation, Marathe Udyog Bhavan, Bombay.
23. Shri J. C. Nangia, Director, Geeta Engineering Works Pvt. Ltd., Bombay.
24. Shri S. K. Sinha, Manager, Dock Machinery Div., Garden Reach Workshop Ltd., Calcutta.
25. Shri S. S. Dotiwala, Chairman, Shipbuilding, Repairing and Ancillary Div., Indian Engineering Association, N. Delhi.
26. Chief Executive, Central Marine Design and Research Organisation, (when set up).
27. Industrial Adviser (HME), Directorate General of Technical Development, New Delhi.
28. Shri Gour Goswami, Member, General Council of AITUC, J/179-A, Paharpur Road, Calcutta.
29. Shri Shyama Prosad Chowdhury, General Secretary, GRW Workers & Employees Union, P-132, Mudially Road, Garden Reach, Calcutta-24.
30. Shri Satish Chandra, Development Officer, Directorate General of Technical Development, Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi.
2. The functions of the Development Council shall be those as enumerated in the Second Schedule to the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951).
3. Shri Satish Chandra, Development Officer, Directorate General of Technical Development, is hereby appointed to carry on the functions of the Secretary of the said Development Council.

[F. No. 16-13/75-H.M.II]

S. M. GHOSH, Joint Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन संतालय

(स्वास्थ्य चिकित्सा)

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2703.—यत केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 की धारा 3 की उग-धारा (1) के खण्ड (८)

का अनुसरण करते हुए एवं मार्गीत अजीत नाथ, जो 23 अप्रैल, 1976 (अप्रार्थन) को सेवा तिवृत हो गए, के स्थान पर संतालय मेना चिकित्सा सेवा के महानिदेशक लेफिटेनेंट जनरल आर एम हूण को 21 अप्रैल, 1976 में भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद का मदस्य मनोनीत किया है।

आवृत्ति अब उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 3 की उग-धारा (1) का ग्रन्त-सरण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा भाग्य सरकार स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय की 9 जनवरी, 1960 की अधिसूचना संख्या 5-13/58-एम० 1 में आगे और निम्नलिखित मार्गदर्शन करती है।

प्रथमतः—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (८) के अधीन मनोनीत शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत अम संख्या २ और उमरे संदर्भित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित अम संख्या और प्रविष्टि रखने ले;

प्रथमतः—

“2. लेफिटेनेंट जनरल आर.एम० हूण, पी० थी० एम० ५८०, ए० थी० एम० ५८०, ए० ए० एम० ५८०, ए० ए० एम० ५८०, महानिदेशक, संतालय सेवा चिकित्सा मेवा।”

[मा० थी० 11013/2/76-एम पी टी]

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

S.O. 2703.—Whereas the Central Government have, in pursuance of clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the India Medical Council Act, 1956, nominated Lt. General R. S. Hoon, Director General, Armed Forces Medical Services, to be a member of the Medical Council of India, with effect from the 24th April, 1976 vice Air Marshal Ajit Nath, who retired on the 23rd April, 1976 (after noon);

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Planning No. 5-13/58-MI, dated the 9th January, 1960, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading “Nominated under clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 3”, for serial No. 2 and the entry relating thereto, the following serial No. and entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“2. Lt. Gen. R. S. Hoon, PVSM, AVSM, FAMS, PHS, Director General, Armed Forces Medical Services”.

[V. 11013/2/76-MPT]

का० आ० 2704.—सरकारी स्थान (अनाप्रिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीति दी गई मारणी के कालम (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारियों को सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी होने के नामे, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोगनार्थ ममता अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है और आगे निरेश देती है कि उक्त अधिकारी उक्त मारणी के कालम 2 में निर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थान के अधिकार बोत्र की सीमाओं में उक्त अधिनियम के हारा अथवा अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा और समता अधिकारी को सीमे गए कर्त्तव्यों का पालन करेगा।

सारणी

अधिकारियों का पदनाम

सरकारी स्थानों की श्रेणियां और अधिकार बोत्र की स्थानीय सीमाएँ अधीक्षक, लेडी रोडिंग स्वास्थ्य स्कूल, लेडी रोडिंग डेल्थ स्कूल, दिल्ली के शिल्पी 110006 अधिकार बोत्र में सभी सरकारी आवास।

[मा० थी० 11029/3/76-एन (एम पी टी)]

एस० थीनिवासन, उप सचिव

S.O. 2704.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being gazetted officer of Government, to be estate officer for the purposes of the said Act, and further directs that the said officer shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on the estate officer by or under the said Act within the limits of her jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

1

2

The Superintendent, Lady Reading Health School, Delhi-110006.

All Government accommodation in the Jurisdiction of Lady Reading Health School, Delhi.

[No. D. 11029/3/76-N(MPT)]

S. SRINIVASAN, Dy. Secy.

का० आ० 2705.—केन्द्रीय सरकार स्वास्थ्य योजना (मद्रास) नियमावली, 1975 के नियम 1 के उपनियम (3) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एवंद्वारा मद्रास के निम्ननिवित भेत्र को आगे और विनियोजित करती है जिसमें उक्त नियमावली लागू होती, अधीन:—

मयलापुर दिस्पेंसरी (सं० 6)

उत्तर में थाउंडेल लाइट्स मास्क की ओर माउंट रोड और पीटर्स रोड के जंक्षन से चल कर पूर्व की ओर पीटर्स रोड वर्षत रोड के साथ-साथ वहाँ तक आगे बढ़िए जहाँ समृद्ध टट तक का धोत्र, फिर वहाँ से दक्षिण की ओर समुद्र टट के साथ-साथ बाला धोत्र जहाँ उसका संगम अड्यार नदी से होता है, फिर वहाँ से पर्सियन की ओर अड्यार नदी के साथ साथ वहाँ तक का धोत्र जहाँ उसका संगम ब्रोट अलग एवंन्य पर माउंडेज गार्डन II स्ट्रीट से होता है, फिर उत्तर की ओर माउंडेज रोड पर, माउंडेज गार्डन II स्ट्रीट के साथ-साथ का धोत्र जहाँ इसका एल्डम्स रोड से संगम होता है, फिर वहाँ से उत्तर की ओर माउंट रोड के साथ साथ वहाँ तक का धोत्र जहाँ से इस श्रोपधानय की दीवा भुग्त होती है।

[संज्ञा एक ओ 12019/34/76-के० स०स्या० यो० 2]

एन० एस० भाटिया, भवर गविव

S.O. 2705.—In pursuance of sub-rule (3) of rule 1 of the Central Government's Health Scheme (Madras) Rules, 1975, the Central Government hereby specifies the following further area in Madras to which the said rules shall extend, namely:—

Mylapore Dispensary (No. 6).

On the north, starting from the junction of Mount Road and Peters Road at Thousand Lights Mosques, proceed east along Peter's Road-Besant Road upto its junction with the sea coast, proceed south along the coast upto its junction with Adyar River, proceed west along with Adyar river upto its junction with Mowbrays Garden II street at Boat Club Avenue, proceed north along Mowbrays Garden II street. Mowbrays Road upto its junction with Eldam's Road, proceed west along Eldam's Road upto its junction with Mount Road, proceed north along Mount Road to reach the starting point.

[No. D. 12019/34/76-CGHS II]

N. S. BHATIA, Under Secy.

हृषि और सिंचाई बंद्रालय

(हृषि विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 3 जूनाई, 1976

का० आ० 2706.—“पूर्व विन्याम अधिनियम, 1890 के अधीन भर कुमरो वाडिया न्याम निधि की प्रतिभूतियों के पुनर्विनियान के विषय में।”

पूर्व विन्याम अधिनियम 1890 (1890 का 6) की धारा 10 द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश करती है कि भारत के पूर्व विन्याम का कोषाल महाराष्ट्र सरकार के हृषि और सहायी विभाग मुम्बई के गविव को 97.08 रु (केवल सतासवे रुपए आठ पैसे) की राशि ब्राविस करेगा जो कि 12,86,100 रु के 1970-75 3 प्रतिशत के प्रथम विकास उधार के पुनर्विनियान आवश्यक से अविनियित पूर्जी अवकाश के रूप में है, जिसमें से 12,86,002.92 रु सरकार कुमरो वाडिया न्यास निधि के मध्ये 12,81,300 रु के 1976 के 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ प्रतिशत महाराष्ट्र सरकार के उधार में पुनर्विनियित किए गए हैं।

[सं० 22-21/75-जी० सी०]

सम्मोहन मिश्र, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION

(Department of Agriculture)

New Delhi, the 3rd July, 1976

S.O. 2706.—“In the matter of reinvestment of the securities of the Sir Cusrow Wadia Trust Fund under the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890”.

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890 (6 of 1890), the Central Government hereby directs that the Treasurer of Charitable Endowments for India shall refund to the Secretary, Government of Maharashtra, Agriculture and Cooperation Departments, Bombay a sum of Rs. 97.08 (Rupees Ninetyseven and paise eight only) as being the un-invested capital balance, out of the reinvestment proceeds of 3% 1st Development Loan 1970-75 for Rs. 12,86,100 of which Rs. 12,86,002.92 have been reinvested in the 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ % Maharashtra Government loan 1976 for Rs. 12,81,300 on account of the Sir Cusrow Wadia Trust Fund.

[No. 22-21/75-Genl. Coord]

SANTOKH SINGH, Dy. Secy.

सूचना और प्रसारण बंद्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 3 जूनाई, 1976

का० आ० 2707.—अपवित्र (सेसर) नियमावली, 1958 के नियम 9 के उप नियम (1) के साथ पठित नियम 8 और अपवित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5(1) के द्वारा प्रवत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एवंद्वारा श्रीमति एन० एस० मणि को तत्काल से श्रीमति आदेश तक, फिल्म सेसर बोर्ड के मध्यम सलाहकार देनेल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[संज्ञा 11/4/74-एफ०सी०]

एस० शोप, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 3rd July, 1976

S.O. 2707.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) and Rule 8 read with sub-rule (1) of Rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints Smt. N. S. Mani as a member of the Advisory Panel of the Board of Film Censors at Madras with immediate effect until further orders.

[No. 11/4/74-FC]
S. GHOSE, Dy. Secy

संचार मंत्रालय

(डाक-तार मंड़ी)

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 1976

का० ग्रा० 2708—नागपतिनम टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की सभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिये जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) (मेर प्रयोगित है नागपतिनम मे चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे मेर यदि उन्हे कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुकाव हो तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये 22 मई 1975 को “इंडियन एक्सप्रेस” मदुराई समाचार पत्र मे प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उल्लंग मे जन साधारण मे कोई आपत्ति और सुकाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिये अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 134 (III) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए महानिवेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-1976 से नागपतिनम का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा—

नागपतिनम टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था—नागपतिनम का स्थानीय क्षेत्र यही होगा जोकि नागपतिनम नगर पालिका के अधिकारीकार म पड़ता है।

किन्तु वे टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो कि नागपतिनम नगर पालिका मीमा के बाहर स्थित हैं किन्तु जिन्हे नागपतिनम टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान हासी है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुँड़े रहेंगे तब तक स्थानीय शुल्क दर मे अवायगी करेंगे।

[म 3-13/74-पी० एच० बी०]

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P & T Board)
New Delhi, the 30th June, 1976

S.O. 2708.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Nagapattinam Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Nagapattinam, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 22nd May 1975 in newspaper 'Indian Express' Madurai;

50 GI/76-3

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Nagapattinam shall be as under;

Nagapattinam Telephone Exchange System

The local area of Nagapattinam shall cover an area falling under the jurisdiction of Nagapattinam Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Nagapattinam Municipal limit but who are served from Nagapattinam Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-13/74-PHB]

का० ग्रा० 2709.—तेनकासी टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की सभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिये जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) मेर प्रयोगित है तेनकासी में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे मेर यदि उन्हे कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुकाव हो तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये 16 व 18 नवम्बर, 1975 को 'दिनामलार' समाचार पत्र मे प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर मे जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुकाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिये अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434(III) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए महानिवेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-1976 से तेनकासी का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :

तेनकासी टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था—तेनकासी का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि तेनकासी नगर पालिका के क्षेत्राधिकार मे पड़ता है,

किन्तु वे टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो कि तेनकासी नगरपालिका सीमा के बाहर स्थित हैं किन्तु जिन्हे तेनकासी टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान होती है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुँड़े रहेंगे तब तक स्थानीय शुल्क दर से अवायगी करेंगे।

[सं 3-13/74-पी० एच० बी०]

S.O. 2709.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Tenkasi Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Tenkasi, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 16th and 18th November 1975 in newspaper 'Dinamalar';

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Tenkasi shall be as under;

Tenkasi Telephone Exchange System

The local area of Tenkasi shall cover an area falling under the jurisdiction of Tenkasi Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Tenkasi Municipal limit but who are served from Tenkasi Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-13/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2710.—शैनकोटाह टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) में व्यक्त है शैनकोटाह में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उन से कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस भूवना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का काट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिये 16 व 18 नवम्बर 1975 को 'दिनामलार' समाचार पत्र में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिये अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434(III) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रवर्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-नार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से शैनकोटाह का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा:—

शैनकोटाह टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—शैनकोटाह का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि शैनकोटाह नगर पालिका के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत पड़ता है।

किन्तु वे टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो कि शैनकोटाह नगरपालिका सीमा के बाहर स्थित हैं किन्तु उन्हें शैनकोटाह टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान होती है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेंज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुड़े रहेंगे जब तक स्थानीय शुल्क दर से अदायी करेंगे।

[सं० 3-13/74 बी० एच० बी०]

S.O. 2710.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Shencottah Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Shencottah, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 16th and 18th November 1975 in newspaper 'Dinamalar';

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Shencottah shall be as under;

Shencottah Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Shencottah shall cover an area falling under the jurisdiction of Shencottah Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Shencottah Municipal limit but who are served from Shencottah Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-13/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2711.—शंकर नगर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) में व्यक्त है शंकर नगर में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उन से कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुझाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की सारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का काट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 19 नवम्बर, 1975 को 'मलाइ मुरासु' व 'दिनामलार' समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (III) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रवर्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-नार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से शंकर नगर का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा:—

शंकर नगर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—शंकर नगर का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि शंकर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के प्रत्यंगत पड़ता है।

किन्तु यह सीमा धरिण में तमामाहली नहीं तक और तिरुनलवेली टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी की रेखा तक होगा।

[सं० 3-13/74-भी०५४०८०८०]

S.O. 2711.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Sankarnagar Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Sankarnagar, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 19th November 1975 in Newspapers 'Malai Murasu' and 'Dina Malar' ;

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Sankarnagar shall be as under;

Sankarnagar Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Sankarnagar shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms radial distance from Sankarnagar Telephone Exchange;

Provided that in South this limit shall be restricted to Tamraparuni River and the line of 5 Kms radial distance from Tirunelveli.

[No. 3-13/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2712.—वारांगल टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने वी बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434(III) (बी बी) में व्यक्त है वारांगल में चालू समाचार पत्रों में

निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुकाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का काट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 10 नवम्बर, 1975 को वैनिक समाचार पत्र 'द ईंकन कॉनिकल' में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुकाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-1976 से भारत का स्थानीय संशोधित शेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :—

वारंगल टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था वारंगल का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि वारंगल नगर पालिका के भीतरिकार में पड़ता है।

किन्तु वे टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो कि वारंगल नगर पालिका सीमा के बाहर स्थित हैं किन्तु जिन्हें वारंगल टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान होती है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेंज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुड़े रहेंगे तब तक स्थानीय गुरुक दर से अदायगी करेंगे।

[स० 3-2/74-पी०एच०बी०]

S.O. 2712.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Warangal Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Warangal, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 10th November 1975 in daily Newspaper "The Deccan Chronicle";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-1976 the revised local area of Warangal shall be as under;

Warangal Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Warangal shall cover an area falling under the jurisdiction of Warangal Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Warangal Municipal limit but who are served from Warangal Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2713.—विजयवाडा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन सीमों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434(iii) (बी बी) में अधिकृत है विजयवाडा में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुकाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का काट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के सिए 12 जनवरी, 1976 को 'हिंडियन एक्सप्रेस' व 13 जनवरी, 1976 की "आन्ध्र पत्रिका" समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुकाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434(iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-1976 से विजयवाडा का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :—

विजयवाडा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—विजयवाडा का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि विजयवाडा नगर पालिका के भीतरिकार में पड़ता है,

किन्तु टेलीफोन प्रयोगकर्ता जो कि विजयवाडा नगर पालिका सीमा के बाहर स्थित है किन्तु जिन्हें विजयवाडा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था से सेवा प्रदान होती है वे इस व्यवस्था के किसी भी एक्सचेंज से जब तक 5 किलोमीटर दूरी के भीतर स्थित रहेंगे और इस व्यवस्था से जुड़े रहेंगे तब तक स्थानीय गुरुक दर से अदायगी करेंगे।

[स० 3-2/74-पी०एच०बी०]

S.O. 2713.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Vijaywada Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Vajaywada, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in Newspaper 'Indian Express' and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper "Andhra Pradesh";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Vijaywada shall be as under;

Vijaywada Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Vijaywada shall cover, an area falling under the jurisdiction of Vijaywada Municipality;

Provided that the telephone subscribers located outside Vijaywada Municipal limit but who are served from Vajaywada Telephone Exchange System shall continue to pay local tariffs as long as they are located within 5 Kms of any exchange of this system and remain connected to it.

[No. 3-2-/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2714.—विजयवाडा ग्रीष्मीयिक सम्पदा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन सीमों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बी बी) में अधिकृत है विजयवाडा ग्रीष्मीयिक सम्पदा में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुकाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का काट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को ईंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आन्ध्र पत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तियां और सुकाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434(iii) (बी बी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित

विधा है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से विजयवाडा आ०स० का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :—

विजयवाडा श्रीधोगिक सम्पदा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—विजयवाडा श्रीधोगिक संपदा का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि विजयवाडा श्रीधोगिक संपदा टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के अंतर्गत पड़ता है,

किन्तु यह सीमा दक्षिण में कृष्णनदी तक, पूर्व में बंदुर रोड और कमुर रोड ज़र्केन पर 5/5 किलोमीटर तक, केमुर रोड और डोनका रोड तक, उत्तर-मध्यम में रिंग रोड तक, और पश्चिम में विजयवाडा नगर पालिका की सीमा तक होगी।

[स० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

S.O. 2714.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Vijaywada Industrial Estate Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, in the Newspapers in circulation at Vijaywada Industrial Estate, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper 'Indian Express' and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper "Andhra Patrika";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Vijaywada Industrial Estate shall be as under ;

Vijaywada Industrial Estate Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Vijaywada Industrial Estate shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms radial distance from the Vijaywada Industrial Estate Telephone Exchange;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to Krishna River in South, to Km 5/5 on Bandur Road and Kanuru Road junction, Kanuru Road and Donka Road in East, to Ring Road in North-West, and boundary of Vijaywada Municipality in West.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2715.—रामवरपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) में व्यक्त है रामवरपाद में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुनाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर ऐसे का कठ करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आनंद पत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्ति और सुनाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से रामवरपाद का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :

रामवरपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—रामवरपाद का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जोकि रामवरपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के अंतर्गत पड़ता है,

किन्तु यह सीमा उत्तर में विजयवाडा-मुस्ताबाद रेलवे लाइन तक, पश्चिम में विजयवाडा नगर पालिका की सीमा तक, और वक्षिण में रिंग रोड, डोनका रोड और कनुर कसरपल्ली रोड होगी।

[स० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

S.O. 2715.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Ramavarapaddu Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Ramavarapaddu inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper 'Indian Express' and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper "Andhra Patrika";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Ramavarapaddu shall be as under;

Ramavarapaddu Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Ramavarapaddu shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms. radial distance from the Ramavarapaddu Telephone Exchange ;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to Vijaywada Mustabad Railway line in the North, boundary of Vijaywada Municipality in the West and Ring Road, Denka Road and Kanuru Kesarapalli Road in the South.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2716.—पोरंकी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बदली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय तार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) में व्यक्त है पोरंकी में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुनाव हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर ऐसे का कठ करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आनंद पत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्ति और सुनाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिदेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से पोरंकी का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा :

पोरंकी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज व्यवस्था—पोरंकी का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि पोरंकी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के अंतर्गत पड़ता है,

किन्तु यह सीमा वक्षिण-पश्चिम में कुण्डानटी, वक्षिण पूर्व में कानुपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी की लाइन, उत्तर में हुर कमरली रोड और उत्तर-पश्चिम में बादुरोड और कनुर रोड जक्षन पर 5/5 कि० मी० तक होगी।

[स० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

S.O. 2716.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Poranki Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, in the Newspapers in circulation at Paranki, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper "Indian Express" and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper "Andhra Patrika";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Poranki shall be as under:

Poranki Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Poranki shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms. radial distance from Poranki Telephone Exchange;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to Krishna River in the South-West, line of 5 Kms radial distance from Kankipaddu Telephone Exchange in the South-East, Kanuru Kesapalli Road in North and Kms 5/5 on Bandar Road and Kanuru Road Junction in North-West.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2717.—मंगल गिरि टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बवली किये जाने के बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वेसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय नार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) में प्रकाशित है मंगलगिरि में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुमात्र हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वेसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आनंद पत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तिया और सुमात्र प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिरेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से मंगलगिरि का स्थानीय मंडोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा।

मंगल गिरि टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था—मंगलगिरि का स्थानीय क्षेत्र यही होगा जोकि मंगलगिरि टेलीफोन एक्सचेज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के प्रत्यंत पड़ता है,

किन्तु यह सीमा पूर्व में लानाली रोड पर 22 कि० मी० तक होगी।

[स० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

S.O. 2717.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Mangalagiri Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Mangalagiri, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

Mangalagiri, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper "Indian Express" and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper "Andhra Patrika";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Mangalagiri shall be as under:

Mangalagiri Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Mangalagiri shall cover an area falling within 15 Kms. radial distance from Mangalagiri Telephone Exchange;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to Kms 22 on Tenali Road in East.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2718.—मुस्ताबाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में बबली किये जाने की बाबत जिन लोगों पर इस परिवर्तन का प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना है एक सर्वेसाधारण सूचना उन सबकी जानकारी के लिए जैसा कि भारतीय नार नियमावली 1951 के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) में प्रकाशित है मुस्ताबाद में चालू समाचार पत्रों में निकाली गई थी और उनसे कहा गया था कि इस बारे में यदि उन्हें कोई आपत्ति हो या उनके कोई सुमात्र हों तो वे इस सूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 दिनों के भीतर भेजने का कष्ट करें।

उक्त सूचना सर्वेसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए 12 जनवरी, 76 को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस और 13 जनवरी, 76 को आनंद पत्रिका समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित कराई गई थी।

उक्त सूचना के उत्तर में जन साधारण से कोई आपत्तिया और सुमात्र प्राप्त नहीं हुए।

इसलिए अब उक्त नियमावली के नियम 434 (iii) (बीबी) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महानिरेशक, डाक-तार ने घोषित किया है, कि तारीख 1-8-76 से मुस्ताबाद का स्थानीय संशोधित क्षेत्र इस प्रकार होगा।

मुस्ताबाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेज व्यवस्था—मुस्ताबाद का स्थानीय क्षेत्र वही होगा जो कि मुस्ताबाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी के अंतर्गत पड़ता है।

किन्तु यह सीमा पश्चिम में तुनाना और रामवरपाद टेलीफोन एक्सचेज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी लाइन, दक्षिण में पोरंकी टेलीफोन एक्सचेज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी लाइन, और पूर्व में गनावरम टेलीफोन एक्सचेज से 5 कि० मी० अरीय दूरी लाइन तक होगी।

[स० 3-2/74-पी० एच० बी०]

प्रा० ना० कील, निरेशक फोन (६)

S.O. 2718.—Whereas a public notice for revising the local area of Mustabad Telephone Exchange System was published as required by rule 434 (III)(bb) of the Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951 in the Newspapers in circulation at Mustabad, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby, within a period of 30 days from the date of publication of the notice in the Newspapers;

And whereas the said notice was made available to the public on 12th January 1976 in newspaper 'Indian Express' and on 13th January 1976 in newspaper "Andhra Patrika";

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received from the public on the said notice;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by rule 434 (III) (bb) of the said Rules, the Director General Posts and Telegraphs hereby declares that with effect from 1-8-76 the revised local area of Mustabad shall be as under;

Mustabad Telephone Exchange System.—The local area of Mustabad shall cover an area falling within 5 Kms radial distance from Mustabad Telephone Exchange;

Provided that this limit shall be restricted to the line of 5 Kms radial distance from Nunna and Ramavarapadu Telephone Exchanges in the West, line of 5 Kms radial distance from Peranki Telephone Exchange in South and line of 5 Kms radial distance from Gannavaram Telephone Exchange in East.

[No. 3-2/74-PHB]

P. N. KAUL, Dir. of Telephones (B)

अम मंत्रालय

प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 24 मार्च, 1976

का० आ० 2719:—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायदू प्रनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स थी० सी० सी० लिमिटेड की रामकनाली कोलियरी, डाकघर कतरास-गढ़ जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धताल से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना चाहनीय समझती है;

ग्रन्त, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (प) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं अम न्यायालय संघया 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स भारत कोलिंग कोल लिमिटेड की रामकनाली कोलियरी, डाकघर कतरास-गढ़ जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धताल की, 4/6/73 से श्री गोपालकृष्ण सहाय, मुंगी और संघी कुमार जनरल बजूदू को काम न नेवे की कार्रवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?

[संख्या एल-20012/97/75-जी-3(ए)]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th March, 1976

S.O. 2719.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Ram Kanali Colliery of M/s B.C.C.Ltd. P.O. Katrasgarh Dist. Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3 Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Ram Kanali Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. Katrasgarh, Dist. Dhanbad is justified in not providing work to Shri Gopal Krishan Sahai, Munshi and Sachi Kumar General Mazdoor with effect from 4-6-73? If not to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled?

[No. L-20012/97/75-D. III(A)]

प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 मई, 1976

का० आ० 2720:—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायदू प्रनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स भारत कोलिंग कोल माइन्स लिंग की जोपिलिह कोलियरी, डाकघर टुन्डू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धताल से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना चाहनीय समझती है;

ग्रन्त, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) खंड (प) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं अम न्यायालय संघया 3, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स भारत कोलिंग कोल लिमिटेड की जोपिलिह कोलियरी, डाकघर टुन्डू, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धताल का थी तिलक महतो, शंडर पाउल ट्रैमर को 19 जुलाई, 1974 से उनके काम से रोक देना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[संख्या एल-20012/237/75 जी 3-(ए)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th May, 1976

S.O. 2720.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Jodih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Mines Limited Post Office Tundoo District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3 Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Jogidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited Post Office Tundoo District Dhanbad are justified in stopping Shri Tilak Mahato Underground Trammer from his work with effect from 19th July, 1974? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. L-20012/237/75-D. IIIA]

प्रादेश

नई विल्ली 11 मई, 1976

का० आ० 2721.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायद अनुसूची में विनिर्विष्ट विषयों के बारे में भेत्र संख्या 6 कोल माईंस अधिकारी लिमिटेड, आकाश भुगमा जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक श्रीयोगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना चाहनीय समझती है;

अतः अब, श्रीयोगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (प) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार श्रीयोगिक अधिकारण एवं अम न्यायालय संख्या 2 धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या कोल माईंस अधारिटी लिमिटेड के केन्द्रीय महाप्रबन्धक, भेत्र सं० 6, आकाश भुगमा (जिला धनबाद) की निम्नलिखित कर्मकारों को प्रत्येक कर्मकार के सामने इशारे गए विभिन्न भेत्रों में, स्थानान्तरित करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है:—

- 1 श्री प्रदीप कुमार चन्द्र, विजली मिस्ट्री 5-2-1975 से लखीमाता कोलियरी से दुमका उप-भेत्र।
2. श्री राम गोरेई, देम्मर, 8-2-75 से मंडमान कोलियरी से भेत्र संख्या 4.
- 3 श्री सदानन्द भिंह, डिलमैन, 8-2-1975 से मंडमान कोलियरी से भेत्र संख्या 5.
4. श्री बाल्मीकि महाराज, माइंस भिरदार, 5-2-1975 से शामपुर-1 कोलियरी से दुमका उप-भेत्र।
5. श्री हरिप्रसाद मल्लाह, इलेक्ट्रिक हैल्पर 8-2-75 से गोपीनाथपुर कोलियरी से भेत्र संख्या 3.
6. श्री रखोहर धनर्जी, श्रीवरमैन, 8-2-1975 से गोपीनाथपुर कोलियरी से भेत्र संख्या 3.
7. श्री हरध्यान धनर्जी, चैनमैन, 8-2-1975 से बादजना कोलियरी से भेत्र संख्या 5.
8. श्री अश्विनी धोरी, लाईन मिस्ट्री, 8-2-1975 से लखीमाता कोलियरी से भेत्र संख्या 5.
9. श्री छेदी सिह, विजली मिस्ट्री, 8-2-1975 से बादजना कोलियरी से भेत्र संख्या 5.
- 10 श्री केशो गोस्वामी, बिल ब्लक, 8-2-1975 से कापासारा कोलियरी से भेत्र संख्या 5.

यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची के हकदार हैं?

[संख्या एल-20012(65)/75-डी 3]

आर०पी० नरुला, अवर सचिव (विशेष)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th May, 1976

S.O. 2721.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Area No. VI Coal Mines Authority Limited Post Office Mugma District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum-Labour Court No. 2 Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the Area General Manager Area No. VI of Coal Mines Authority Limited Post Office Mugma (District Dhanbad) in transferring the following workmen of different areas as indicated against each workman is justified:—

1. Shri Pradeep Kumar Chandra, Electrician, Lakhimata Colliery to Dumka Sub Area w.e.f. 5-2-75.
2. Shri Ram Gorai, Trammer, Mandman Colliery to Area No. IV with effect from 8-2-75.
3. Shri Sadanand Singh, Drillman, Mandman Colliery to Area No. V with effect from 8-2-75.
4. Shri Balmiki Mahara, Mining Sirdar Shampur-I Colliery to Dumka Sub Area w.e.f. 5-2-75.
5. Shri Hari Prasad Mallah, Electric Helper Gopinathpur Colliery to Area No. III w.e.f. 8-2-75.
6. Shri Rakho Hari Bannerjee overman Gopinathpur Colliery to Area No. III w.e.f. 8-2-1975.
7. Shri Haradhan Bhandari Chainman Badjna Colliery to Area No. V w.e.f. 8-2-75.
8. Shri Aswini Bouri, Line Mistry Lakhimata Colliery to Area No. V w.e.f. 8-2-75.
9. Shri Chedi Singh Electrician Badjna Colliery to Area No. V w.e.f. 8-2-75.
10. Shri D. K. Goswami Bill Clerk, Kapasara Colliery to Area No. V w.e.f. 8-2-75.

If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?

[No. L-20012/65/75-D. IIIA]

R. P. NARULA, Under Secy.

प्रादेश

नई विल्ली, 10 मई, 1976

का० आ० 2722.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायद अनुसूची में विनिर्विष्ट विषयों के बारे में यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया से मस्बद नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक श्रीयोगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना चाहनीय समझती है,

अतः अब श्रीयोगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (प) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का

प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त मधिनियम की धारा 7 के अंतीम गठित श्रीयोगिक मधिकरण (संख्या 1), वर्षावही और स्पायरनियर्यन के लिए निर्विशित करती है।

अनुसूची

व्यायाम सूची वैक शाफ इंडिया, अकोला शाखा के प्रबन्धतंत्र की श्री मोहन एम. अग्रवाल, लिपिक की सेवाएं 16 जून, 1974 से समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही व्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है?

[संख्या एस-12012(179)/75-डी-20]

प्रार० कुर्जीयापवम, अवर मन्त्रिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th May, 1976

S.O. 2722.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Union Bank of India and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal No. (1) Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of the Union Bank of India, Akola Branch in terminating the services of Shri Mohan N. Agarwal Clerk with effect from the 16th June 1974 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L. 12012/179/75/DII(A)]

R. KUNJITHAPADAM, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1976

S.O. 2723.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Delhi Rohtas Light Railway Company Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 1st July, 1976.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 8 of 1974

(Ministry's Order No. L-41012/10/74/LRIJL,
Dated, 15-6-1974)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Company Limited.

AND

Their Workmen.

PARTIES :

Mr. Justice K. B. Srivastava (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri J. N. P. Sinha, Advocate.

For the Workmen : Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

State : Bihar.

Industry : Railway.

Dhanbad, dated the 28th June, 1976

AWARD

The introductory facts (leaving aside the details thereto which will appear in the discussions) lie within a narrow compass.

2. The Dehri Rohtas Light Railway (hereinafter called the Railway Company) is a "Railway Company", within the meaning of clause (o) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, (hereinafter called the Act), read with clause (5) of Section 3 of the Indian Railways Act, 1890 (hereinafter called the Railways Act). The track of the Railway is very short, being 66.34 Kilometres. There are only 17 Railway Stations (including a flag station) : Dehri-On-Sone being the first and Tiura Pipradih the last on this track. Rohtas Station is the 10th and Nawhatta Road is the 15th Station. Shri A. Kumar, the Traffic Manager of the Railway Company, issued a declaration Ext. W-1 (Ext. M-7 being a copy of the same) on January 21/25, 1974 classifying the employment of all the Station Masters/Assistant Station Masters as "essentially intermittent" between Rohtas and Nawhatta Road Stations. By a similar declaration Ext. W-2 (Ext. M-8 being a copy of that) dated January 30, 1974 the Traffic Manager classified the employment of all Station Masters/Assistant Station Masters/Pointsmen as "essentially intermittent" in respect of all the 17 Stations. Thus Pointsmen who were formerly excluded from the first declaration Ext. W-1, were included in the second declaration Ext. W-2. The second change made by Ext. W-2 was that instead of the declaration applying only to Stations between Rohtas and Nawhatta Road, it was now applied to all the 17 Stations from Terminus to Terminus, that is to say, from Dehri-On-Sone to Tiura Pipradih. The effect of these two declarations was to enhance the working hours from 8 to 12. A copy of these two declarations was duly sent by the Traffic Manager to the Regional Labour Commissioner. The employees of the Railway Company felt dis-satisfied with these two declarations and consequently Shri Radha Raman Prasad, WW-1, the General Secretary of the Delhi Rohtas Light Railway Mazdoor Sewa Sangh, an unrecognised Union (hereinafter called the Union), sent an application Ext. M-31 to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Patna on January 31, 1974 protesting that the Railway Company had effected a change in the conditions of service applicable to the employees in that the working hours had been enhanced from 8 to 12 and he (Assistant Labour Commissioner) should intervene and stop the Railway Company from changing the hours of work without compliance with Section 9A of the Act. The Assistant Labour Commissioner, Patna, transferred the application Ext. M-31 to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Hazaribagh for necessary action on February 15, 1974. The latter wrote the letter Ext. M-32 on February 25, 1974 to the Secretary of the Railway Company forwarding therewith a copy of the application of the union to him and inviting him to participate in conciliation proceedings. In the meantime, the Railway Company had withdrawn its two declarations with effect from February 14, 1974 by a circular Ext. M-9. The Railway Company sent the letter Ext. M-10 to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Hazaribagh on April 15, 1974 in reply to Ext. M-32 wherein the attitude taken up by the Railway Company was that (1) the union was not a recognised union and was thus not entitled to raise any industrial dispute, and (2) it (The Railway Company) had classified the employment from "continuous" to "essentially intermittent", in exercise of its statutory powers, as a purely temporary measure during a period of emergency and Section 9A of the Act had no application. The conciliation proceedings ended in failure, as no meeting ground could be found in the view points of the union and the Railway Company. Accordingly the Assistant Labour Commissioner sent a failure report Ext. M-11 to the Central Government on April 22, 1974 wherein he specified the dispute thus, namely, (1) competency or otherwise of the union to raise the industrial dispute, (2) the legal validity or otherwise of the two declarations without compliance with Section 9A of the Act, and (3) liability or otherwise for payment for overtime work beyond 8 hours.

3. The Central Government, in exercise of its powers under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Act, has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Company Limited, Dalmia Nagri to change the working hours of Station Masters, Assistant Station Masters and pointsmen employed by them during the period from 25th January, 1974 to 13th February, 1974 was legal and justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

4. In response to the notices issued to the parties, the workmen filed their written statement on July 5, 1974; and the Railway Company filed its written statement, as also its rejoinder to the written statement of the workmen, on July 17, 1974. The workmen filed their rejoinder to the written statement of the Railway Company, on July 24, 1974.

5. No issues were framed by my learned predecessor-in-office.

6. The parties have adduced both oral and documentary evidence. The Union has examined Radha Raman Prasad as WW-1 and Railway Company has produced D. K. Jain and Phulendra Prasad as MWS.1 and 2. In addition, the Union has filed four documents Ext. W-1 to W-4 and the Railway Company has filed 32 documents Ext. M-1 to M-32.

7. Several questions of law and fact were canvassed before the Tribunal, and I propose to take them now, one by one.

8. The first contention raised by the Railway Company is that the union on the espousal of which the reference has been made, is an un-recognised union which does not possess a representative character to act on behalf of the body of workmen and as such the espousal made by it will not convert the dispute, if any, into an "Industrial Dispute", within the meaning of Sec. 2(k) of the Act. The stand taken by the union in this regard is that no doubt it has been recognised by the Railway Company but nonetheless it is the only representative union of the workmen of the Railway Company a fact which was verified by the Central Government itself who advised the Railway Company to grant recognition to it but due to malaises on the part of the Railway Company, recognition is not forthcoming but that fact of non-recognition will have no effect on its legal right to sponsor the cause so as to convert it into an industrial dispute.

9. Admittedly, there are two rival unions amongst the employees of the Railway Company, one called the Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Employees' Union (hereinafter called the recognised Union) which is a registered trade union and has been recognised by the Railway Company, and the second, the union before the Tribunal which is also a registered trade union but is un-recognised. There is a short history which will elucidate the position. It appears that the union, after its registration as a trade union, took up the matter of recognition with the Government of India, Department of Labour and Employment, sometime in the year 1971. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) called for certain information from the union and informed the Railway Company also about the pending proceeding with regard to the matter of recognition. This will be apparent from Annexure 3 to Ext. M-28. On a consideration of the information collected, the Deputy Director, Department of Labour and Employment, informed the union by letter Ext. W-3 dated February 3, 1972 that the union had been found to be eligible for recognition and the Railway Company has been requested to confer recognition on it. A letter (Annexure 5 of Ext. M-28) was despatched on the same date by the Deputy Director to the Railway Company also mentioning therein that the verification made by the Chief Labour Commissioner's Organisation revealed that the union represented the majority of the employees and was thus entitled to recognition under the Code of Discipline in place of the recognised union and since under the said Code, only the majority union can function as a recognised union, the Railway Company should confer recognition upon the union and withdraw it from the recognised union. The recognised union thereupon filed a writ petition in the Patna High Court (Ext. M-28) and obtained a stay order (Ext. M-22) on March 25,

1972 to the effect that the Government of India's direction to the Railway Company to withdraw recognition from the recognised union shall remain stayed during the pendency of the writ petition. The Railway Company apprised the Government of India about the situation created by the stay order by its letter Ext. M-29 dated April 5, 1972. The above position has remained un-disputed before me. It comes to this, therefore, that there are two rival unions; both are registered trade unions, one is recognised and the other un-recognised by the Railway Company. The matter of de-recognition of the recognised union is in a state of suspension on account of the prohibitory order issued by the High Court. However, there is no prohibition imposed on the recognition of the union. Be that as it may, I must take into reckoning the fact that on a verification made by an independent authority, the union was found to be more representative of the employees than the recognised union. Indeed, a direction was issued by the Government of India to withdraw recognition of the recognised union and to confer it upon the union. In the circumstance, therefore, it is not possible for me to hold that the union is not entitled to raise an industrial dispute on behalf of the employees of the Railway Company. It was argued by the learned counsel for the railway Company that the union has not filed a copy of any resolution passed by its Executive Committee authorising Radha Raman Prasad, WW-1 to raise the dispute on behalf of the employees and, therefore, it should be held that Radha Raman Prasad has no authority on behalf of the union to raise the dispute. I regret I cannot accept this contention as well-founded either in fact or in law. If the Railway Company intended to challenge this position, it should have raised a specific plea either in its written statement, or at any rate, in its rejoinder but there is a conspicuous omission of this fact. On the other hand, the Railway Company itself elicited in the cross-examination of Radha Raman Prasad that a Resolution was passed by the Executive Committee of the union that the dispute should be raised regarding the question of classification. It is immaterial, therefore, in the circumstances, that a copy of the original Resolution has not been exhibited. There has to be a presumption that when the union takes action, it is as a representative of, and with the support of its members; and it is for the party contesting this fact to prove that the facts are otherwise and that the members of the union are not behind it in its action. See Hindustan Times Limited Vs. Chief Commissioner, 1957 (II) LLJ. 466 and Express News Papers (P) Limited Vs. First Labour Court 1959 (I) LLJ. 600 Again, the contention that an un-recognised union cannot take up the cause in the process of collective bargaining on behalf of its members, has only to be stated to be rejected. It was held by their Lordships of the Supreme Court in State of Bihar Vs. Kripa Shankar Jaiswal 1961 (I) LLJ. 334 that it would be an erroneous view if it were said that for a dispute to constitute an industrial dispute it is a requisite condition that it should be sponsored by a recognised union or that all the workmen of an industrial establishment should be parties to it. I have, therefore, no hesitation in rejecting this contention.

10. The next contention of the learned counsel for the Railway Company is that the dispute, if any, in question, is not an industrial dispute, capable of reference under Section 10(1)(d) and as such this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to deal with the matter. The contention is based on two propositions, namely, (1) that until a demand was made by the union on the Railway Company directly, there cannot be an industrial dispute capable of reference, and (2) if a schedule of hours of employment, is the direct result of classification of employment under a statute or rules framed thereunder, then, the Fourth Schedule, or Section 9A of the Act, or for that matter, the Act itself can have no application so that even if there is a dispute between the union and the Railway Company in the ordinary sense of the term, it cannot become an industrial dispute under Sec. 2(K) for the simple reason that the Act has no application. I propose to deal with these two propositions separately from each other.

11. The reliance for the first proposition is placed on Sindhu Re-Settlement Corporation Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal, AIR 1968 SC. 529 and Fedders, Lloyd Corporation (Pvt) Limited Vs. Lt. Governor, AIR 1970 Delhi 60. In the Supreme Court Case, Ambwaney, after collecting retrenchment compensation from the subsidiary concern on his retrenchment, went to the principal concern and made request for a posting order which was refused and then demanded retrenchment compensation, which was also refused. His case was taken up by his union and both Ambwaney and the union

wrote separately to the principal demanding retrenchment compensation and not re-instatement. Thereafter there were some conciliation proceedings and on the report of the Conciliation Officer, the Government referred the demand for reinstatement for adjudication to the Tribunal. The point raised was that the dispute that Ambwaney and the union had raised before the principal concern was confined to compensation for retrenchment and did not relate to the validity of the retrenchment or re-instatement and consequently the Government had no jurisdiction to refer the dispute relating to the question or reinstatement to the Tribunal. On these facts, the Supreme Court held that since both Ambwaney and union demanded payment of retrenchment compensation only by the principal concern and did not raise any dispute for re-instatement, the Government was competent to refer the question of retrenchment compensation only to the tribunal and not the question of re-instatement. It further observed that no doubt the order of reference mentions that the Government had considered the report submitted by the conciliation officer under Section 12(4) of the Act in respect of the dispute between the parties over the demand mentioned in the schedule and, in the schedule, the Government mentioned that the dispute was that of re-instatement: and it may be that the Conciliation Officer reported to the Government that an industrial dispute did exist relating to reinstatement, but the evidence produced before the Tribunal clearly showed that no such dispute had ever been raised by Ambwaney or by his union with the principal concern, and if no dispute at all was raised by the two with the principal concern, any request sent by them to the Government would only be a demand by them and not an industrial dispute between them and the principal concern. A mere demand to the Government, without a dispute being raised by the workmen with the employer, cannot become an industrial dispute. It was further observed that the two had confined their demands to the principal concern to retrenchment compensation only and did not make any demand for reinstatement and, therefore the reference made by the Government was not competent. In the Delhi High Court case, Ajab Singh either resigned his job or was retrenched by the company. Thereafter he did not make any demand on the company directly. He, however, wrote to the Labour Commissioner stating that his services had been terminated by way of retrenchment which was wrongful and arbitrary and he was entitled to re-instatement. The claim of Ajab Singh was sent by the conciliation officer to the company for comments, but no comments were received in writing. The matter was, however, orally discussed and the company conveyed to the conciliation officer its defence on merits and resisted the claim of Ajab Singh on the ground that there was no industrial dispute which could be referred to adjudication. As there was no possibility of settlement, the conciliation proceedings were closed and a failure report was made by the conciliation officer to the Government. On a consideration of the report under Section 12(5), the Government referred the dispute to the Labour Court for adjudication. The company thereupon filed a writ petition in the High Court. Dua C. J. and Deshpande J. made certain preliminary observations, namely, that a dispute or difference in Section 2(k) means that one party asserts something, which is denied by the other or that the demand of one party is refused by the other: that Section 12, read with Section 10, does not contemplate that an industrial dispute can arise for the first time during the proceedings before the conciliation officer: that Section 10(2), read with Rule 3(c) of the Rules presupposes efforts made by the parties themselves to adjust the dispute before an approach can be made to Government for reference to adjudication. Their Lordships then proceeded to interpret the Supreme Court decision (Supra) to ascertain its proper scope and implication and observed thus;

"The Supreme Court has also clarified that even if the conciliation officer found that an industrial dispute existed and so reported to the Government, this could not be regarded as the existence of the industrial dispute which has to be founded upon a demand by the workmen on the employers. If this is the ratio of the Supreme Court decision it cannot be said that an industrial dispute existed.... as no demand was made.... on the company before he made an application under Sec. 10(2) for reference. In that event the fact that the demand

.... was forwarded by the conciliation officer to the.... company and was not accepted by the latter would not constitute an industrial dispute."

Their Lordships then considered the decision in Standard Coal Company Vs. S. P. Verma, AIR 1952 Pat. 56 and observed that the decision may not be correct as it is opposed to the above Supreme Court decision. Their Lordships also considered the decisions in Goodyear (India) Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal, 1968 (II) LLJ. 682 and Kandan Textile Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal, AIR 1951 Madras 616 and did not feel inclined to follow them, and summed up the position thus :

"We are of the view that the decision of the Supreme Court in AIR 1968 SC 529.....has finally established the proposition that a demand by the workmen must be raised first on the management and rejected by them before an industrial dispute can be said to arise and exist and that the making of such a demand to the conciliation officer and its communication by him to the management, which reject the same is not sufficient to constitute an industrial dispute. The decisions and dicta of some of the High Courts to the contrary can no longer be considered good law."

12. I shall now undertake, in brief, a survey of the other case—law on this very subject. In Ramayya Pantulu Vs. Kuty and Rao, 1949 LLJ. 13, the observation made by the Madras High Court was that a reference would be competent where an industrial dispute exists or is apprehended and this will depend upon the demands made by the workmen and refusal on the part of the management to comply with these demands, which demands and refusal would necessarily involve discussions taking place amongst the workmen and the management. In Kandan Textile Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal, 1949 LLJ. 875, the President of the union never made any demand on the management and instead wrote to the Government that an industrial dispute existed in respect of 11 items. The Government made an order of reference in respect of these 11 items, purporting to do so on the basis of two letters of the Labour Commissioner, even though these letters specified the industrial dispute in respect of a different matter not covered by the 11 items. On these facts, the Madras High Court held that the reference was bad. Rajamannar, C.J., based this finding on the ground that the union had not the authority on behalf of the workmen to raise the dispute. Incidentally however, his Lordships further mentioned that there was no evidence that the workmen had made a demand which the employer had refused. Mack, J., agreed with the ultimate decision in the case but made contrary observation about demand and refusal being pre-requisite conditions for the constitution of an industrial dispute. He observed that the two letters of the Labour Commissioner mentioned the existence of an industrial dispute about the insistence on the part of the management to take back some workmen in order of proficiency and not of seniority and this may in law be an industrial dispute brought as it was to the notice of the Government by one of its responsible officers, which would justify a reference on that point. In Standard Coal Company Limited Vs. S. P. Verma, AIR 1952 Patna 56, where the colliery had closed down, the President of the Mines Association wrote directly to the Government for intervention to ensure the continued employment of the colliery workers. The workmen also took up the matter separately with the regional Labour Commissioner for the maintenance of the status quo until the dispute was settled. The dispute was further brought to the notice of the Government by the President of a rival union of the colliery. The Regional Labour Commissioner made a report to the Government for making a reference to the Tribunal and in pursuance thereof the Government made such a reference. The contention raised before the Patna High Court was that unless the workmen made a demand upon the employer who refuses it, the demand cannot form the basis of an industrial dispute and in support of this contention the decision in Kandan Textile Limited case was pressed in harness. The High Court observed :

"In our opinion, these passages were not intended to be absolute tests applicable in all cases, but if they were so intended us respectfully to differs....on that particular point. There may be instance where

workers may consider it wholly useless to make a demand on the management and prefer to move the appropriate machinery set up by the Government for redress of their grievances. But nevertheless, it will be an industrial dispute if it comes within the meaning of Sec. 2(k)"

A somewhat contrary observation was made by the Patna High Court in Members of Sasamusa Workers' Union Vs. State of Bihar, AIR 1952 Patna, 210 where a strike notice included 48 demands but the Government made reference only in respect of 4 demands and the contention raised was that the Government was not competent to refer 4 demands only for adjudication. The High Court observed that since there was no material to show that the notice of strike was served upon the management or reasonable opportunity was given to it to comply with the demands of the union, it cannot be held that there was an industrial dispute with reference to 48 demands so as to make out the existence of an industrial dispute. In Management of Radio Foundation Engineering Limited Vs. State of Bihar, AIR 1970 Pat. 295 the workmen contended that while the charter of their demands was still under conciliation, the company closed down its work and refused to employ them. The Management resisted this plea on the ground that it had issued notices of termination of service but before that date could arrive, the workmen had unilaterally stopped work without giving notice. The workmen made a grievance about the alleged lock-out to the Government which made a reference for adjudication to the Tribunal. The company pleaded that no dispute was raised by the workmen with it and hence there was no industrial dispute which could be made the subject-matter of adjudication. Reliance for this contention was placed on AIR 1952 Pat. 210 (Supra) and AIR 1968 SC 529 (Supra) that in the absence of a demand and refusal it could not be said that there was in existence any industrial dispute. The High Court observed that something happened during the course of conciliation proceedings, resulting in the stoppage of the workmen from work. Naturally then a dispute arose as to what was the reason for the stoppage of the work and the reason of that stoppage of work was an industrial dispute. On the facts therefore, no specific demand by the workmen was necessary to bring out the existence of an industrial dispute. Their Lordships then proceeded to lay down the following propositions of law :—

"If, therefore, the workmen concerned approached the Government for redress of their grievances because of the alleged lock-out, by bringing the facts to the notice of the Government, it is difficult to accept the contention that there was no dispute raised before the management in that regard. The dispute obviously was there which resulted in the stoppage of the work In all cases it is not necessary that the dispute must be preceded by a demand and a refusal in express terms by the parties concerned. If on the evidence adduced before the Tribunal it is found that the industrial dispute did not exist or was not apprehended, the reference may be held to be incompetent. But, to say that, merely because in express terms no such dispute was raised before the management by the workmen, there was in fact no dispute and hence the reference is incompetent, will not be correct It may also well be that if a different kind of demand is made before the management and the reference is of a different kind, then also the reference is incompetent, as was the case before the Supreme Court in AIR 1958 SC 529. The claim put forward before the management was for payment of retrenchment compensation and not for re-instatement, but the demand put forward before the Government was for a re-instatement also In the facts of the instant case, the demand was to allow them to work. The management would not allow them to work. The resultant of this dispute was an industrial dispute as to the alleged lock-out. No further demand in respect of that dispute was necessary and when a grievance was made before the Government by the workmen the Government was competent to make a reference " In Goodyear (India) Limited vs. Industrial Tribunal, 1968 (II) LLJ. 682, the Rajasthan High Court also took the view that a

direct demand on the management was not necessary to convert a dispute into an industrial dispute. In that case, the employee whose services had been terminated, moved an application before the conciliation officer, challenging the termination of his service and requesting for re-instatement. The company opposed his re-instatement. The High Court observed that it cannot, in the circumstances, be said that no industrial dispute had been raised by the employee with the company. The High Court, in this connection, distinguished the decision of the Supreme Court in AIR 1968 SC 529 just on the lines in which it had been distinguished by the Patna High Court in AIR 1970 Pat. 295.

13. The review of the case law will thus indicate that the decision of their Lordships of the Supreme Court in AIR 1968 SC 529 is not of universal application. For one thing, that decision can have no application to a case where a reference is made not in respect of an existing industrial dispute but in a case of an apprehended industrial dispute, where the question of making a demand and a refusal of that demand, may hardly arise. This point has been elaborately illustrated by the Calcutta High Court in Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha Limited vs. Fourth Industrial Tribunal, 1973 (I) LLJ 146, wherein the following observation was made :

"In my opinion, under Section 10 the dispute which is capable of reference can be either an existing dispute or an apprehended dispute. Therefore under Section 10 a reference is possible even in case where there had been no prior demand or refusal if there is apprehension in the mind of the Government that a dispute might arise. The decision of the Supreme Court in AIR 1968 SC 529, must be understood in the back-ground of the facts of that case. The said decision did not have occasion to consider whether under Section 10 a dispute which was apprehended could or might be raised and whether in such a case a prior demand or refusal was necessary. " In the decision of the Supreme Court, there is no indication as to what transpired before the conciliation officer. It may be that that officer sent a copy of the demand to the Corporation for comments, but it may as well be that the Corporation did not send any comments. It may further be that the Corporation refused to participate in the conciliation proceedings, and did not appear either to accept or reject the demand. Or it may be, that the Corporation appeared before the conciliation officer but there also no demand for re-instatement was made and the demand was confined to the demand for retrenchment compensation only. The decision of the Supreme Court will apply to a case where the facts are similar. Their Lordships have not decided that if a demand is made before a conciliation officer and is rejected by the management, then, in that case also, there would be no industrial dispute. In Ramayya Pantulu's case, also there was no decision on the question whether a demand and a refusal made before a conciliation officer will remain a dispute only and not become an industrial dispute. In Kandan Textile Limited case, no demand was made even before the conciliation officer: the conciliation officer recommended the reference on another matter, not included in the demands: and the two learned Judges constituting the Bench made contrary observations on the question whether a demand and a refusal are or are not pre-requisites for converting a dispute into an industrial dispute. In Standard Coal Company's case, there was a clear law laid down that the demand on the management is not necessary. In Sasamusa Workers' Union case, which was decided earlier than the Standard Coal Company's case, certainly a contrary view was expressed, though the main decision turned on the question whether the Government is or is not competent to ignore some demands and

make reference in respect of others. In Radio Foundation's case there was a categorical decision that a prior demand with the management is not a condition precedent for a dispute to become an industrial dispute. The view taken by the Rajasthan High Court in the Goodyear's case is in consonance with the view of the Patna High Court in the first and the last cases. This Tribunal is subject to the jurisdiction of the Patna High Court, and when the decision of their Lordships of the Supreme Court is distinguishable and as such not applicable to the instant case, I am bound to follow the view propounded by the Patna High Court and, therefore, I hold that the making of a prior demand is not necessary to the raising of an industrial dispute, in all cases. Indeed, in the instant case, there was a confrontation between the union and the Railway Company during the course of conciliation proceedings. The Assistant Labour Commissioner sent a copy of the Union's applications Ext. M-31 to the Railway Company and invited it to participate in the proceedings, vide Ext. M-32. Ext. M-10 is the letter sent by the Railway Company to the Assistant Labour Commissioner resisting the demand of the union. Ext. M-11 is the report of the Assistant Labour Commissioner which mentions that the stand taken by the Railway Company is contained in their letter Ext. M-10. There was, therefore, a demand made by the union and a refusal of that demand by the Railway Company and that, to my mind, is sufficient to make the dispute an industrial dispute.

14. I shall now take up the second proposition of the second contention. The Railway Company is a "Public Limited Company" under the Indian Companies Act. It is not disputed that it carries on an "Industry" within the meaning of Section 2(j) of the Act. Section 71A of the Railway Act, in so far as it is relevant for the present purpose, reads thus:

71-A. Definition.—

In this Chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:—

- (a) the employment of a railway servant is said to be "continuous" except when it is excluded or has been declared to be essentially intermittent or intensive;
- (b) the employment of a railway servant is said to be "essentially intermittent" when it has been declared to be so by the prescribed authority on the ground that the daily hours of duty of the railway servant normally include periods of inaction aggregating six hours or more (including at least one such period of not less than one hour or two such periods of not less than half an hour each), during which the railway servant may be on duty, but is not called upon to display either physical activity or sustained attention;
- (c) the employment of a railway servant is said to be "excluded", if he belongs to any one of the following categories, namely;
- (v) such staff as may be specified as supervisory staff by the Central Government by rules made under section 71E. An analysis of Section 71A will reveal that the employment of a railway servant is of four categories, namely:
 - (1) continuous.
 - (2) essentially intermittent,
 - (3) excluded, and
 - (4) intensive.

Normally, the employment is continuous, except where it is excluded or has been declared to be "essentially intermi-

ttent" by the prescribed authority. Section 71-E, in so far as it is applicable to the present purpose, reads:

71-E. Power to make rules:—

(1) The Central Government may make rules—

- (a) prescribing the authorities who may declare that the employment of any railway servant is essentially intermittent; and providing for appeals against any such declaration and the manner in which, and the conditions subject to which, any such appeal may be filed and heard.

In exercise of its powers under sub-section (1) of Section 71-E, the Central Government made the Railway Servants (Hours of Employment) Rules, 1961. Rules 3 and 4, which are relevant, reads thus:

3. Power to Classify the Employment of a Railway Servant.—

- (1) The power to declare the employment of a railway servant as essentially intermittent within the meaning of section 71A shall vest with the Head of the Railway Administration or with an officer not below the rank of a senior scale officer as a temporary measure during the periods of emergency.

- (2) A copy of every declaration made under sub-rule (1) shall be sent to the Regional Labour Commissioner.

4. Appeals against Classification.—

- (1) If any question arises in respect of a declaration made under rule 3, the matter shall be referred to the Regional Labour Commissioner whose decision, subject to the provision of sub-rule (2) shall be final.

- (2) Any person aggrieved by a decision of the Regional Labour Commissioner may, before the expiry of 30 days from the date on which the decision of the Regional Labour Commissioner is communicated to him, prefer an appeal to the Government whose decision thereon shall be final.

The ambit of Rules 3 and 4 is quite clear. The power to declare the employment of a railway servant as essentially intermittent can be exercised either by the Head of the Railway Administration or by any officer provided he is not an officer below the rank of a senior scale officer. The power can be exercised as a temporary measure and that also during a period of emergency. A copy of every declaration of classification has to be sent to the Regional Labour Commissioner. An exercise of the power in contravention of Rule 3 will be illegal and invalid. The effect of a validly declared classification is final, if not challenged under sub-rule (1) of Rule 4 before a Regional Labour Commissioner. In case the railway servants affected by the declaration wish to challenge its propriety or validity, they have to raise that question before the Regional Labour Commissioner. If his decision turns in favour of the railway servants, the Railway Administration or the Railway Company may file an appeal before the Government; while if the decision of the Regional Labour Commissioner is against the railway servants, they may similarly appeal to the Government. The decision of the Regional Labour Commissioner is final, where no appeal is made, and where an appeal is made by either side, it is the decision of the Government which becomes final. The Traffic Manager of the Railway Company, in exercise of the powers under Rule 3, made the first declaration Ext. M-1 on January 21/25, 1974 whereby he converted the continuous service of each Station Master/Assistant Station Master to essentially intermittent between Rohtas and Nawhatta Road railway stations. By the second declaration Ext. W-2 dated January 30, 1974, he converted the continuous service of all Pointsman also into essentially intermittent and extended the first, as also the second, declaration over the entire route. The effect of these declarations was admittedly to enhance the duty hours from 8 to 12 which is within the permissible limits under section 71C. It has been seen earlier that the declarations were, as required by sub-rule (2) of Rule 3, sent to the Regional Labour Commissioner. This fact has been asserted in categorical terms in paragraph 24 of the written statement of the Railway Company and has not been denied or controverted by the union in para 24 of its rejoinder. It must be taken, therefore, that the Railway Company fully complied

with this requirement of the rule. It is admitted that the union did not raise any question about the propriety, correctness or validity of the declarations before the Regional Labour Commissioner inviting him to give his decision on the question and consequently no question of an appeal, arose in the matter. The union submitted to the two declarations without demur and without agitating it before the competent authority, in the manner, required by the Rule. These two declarations, therefore, took the shape of finality. The union has, however, challenged both the propriety and the validity of the two declarations before the Tribunal for a variety of reasons, namely,

- (1) The declarations are invalid for non-compliance with the mandatory provisions of Section 9A of the Act.
- (2) They are bad because they were not issued by the prescribed authority,
- (3) They are bad because they are the result of malafides,
- (4) They are bad because they amount to unfair labour practice,
- (5) They are bad because they were issued when there was no emergency; and
- (6) They are again bad because they applied to a prolonged period of time and were not intended to be purely as a temporary measure.

None of these contentions, however, is sustainable either in law or, where they are founded on fact, on fact.

15. Section 9A of the Act, relevant for our present purpose, reads thus :

9A. Notice of change.—No employer, who proposes to effect any change in the conditions of service applicable to any workman in respect of any matter specified in the Fourth Schedule, shall effect such change,—

- (a) without giving to the workmen likely to be affected by such change a notice in the prescribed manner of the nature of the change proposed to be affected; or
- (b) within twenty-one days of giving such notices :

Provided that no notice shall be required for effecting any such change—

- (b) where the workmen likely to be affected by the change are persons to whom any other rules or regulations that may be notified in this behalf by the appropriate Government in the Official Gazette, apply.

The Fourth Schedule as the title "conditions of service for change of which notice is to be given"; and item 4 of this schedule reads "Hours of work and rest intervals". The contention of the union is that it is a condition of service of railway servants that their duty hours will be 8 and since this was enhanced from 8 to 12 without compliance with Section 9A by giving notice, and without waiting for the expiry of the statutory period of 21 days, the declarations are bad. Section 2(k) uses two phrases: "the terms of employment" and "conditions of labour" while Section 9A uses the words "conditions of service". It can admit of no doubt that the expressions "term of employment" and "conditions of service" or "conditions of labour" certainly cover hours of work. See Secretary, Madras Gymkhana Club Employees' Union Vs. Gymkhana Club, AIR 1968 SC 554. The expression "terms of employment" is wider in scope than the expression "conditions of service". See Ram Nath Koeri Vs. Lakshmi Devi Sugar Mills, 1956 (II) LLJ 11. The employment is the contract of service between the employer and the employees whereunder the employees agree to serve the employer, subject to the terms of employment. The conditions of employment may be laid down by a contract or by law or by an order, executive or statutory, of a Government. If the hours of work are a term of a contract of service entered into between the employer and his employees, these may not be absolute and will, in all cases, be subject to and can be

regulated by a law on the subject. Where, however, the hours of work are controlled and regulated by statute or by a rule or regulation made thereunder, it will be these hours of work which will be binding on the employers and the employees. The power to classify the employment of railway servants as continuous, essentially intermittent, excluded or intensive is a statutory power under Section 71A read with Section 71E, of the Railways Act and if the power is exercised under rule 3, the effect in duty hours is that a railway servant whose employment is essentially intermittent may have to work for 12 hours and a railway servant whose employment is excluded may have to work all the 24 hours. This will be on the basis of exercise of statutory power to classify the employment of railway servants and not by way of a change in the conditions of labour or in the conditions of service. As has been stated earlier, the terms of employment with regard to duty hours in the case of railway servants is not a matter of contract or a matter of conditions of service, but is essentially one which pertains to a statutory power to classify the employment of such servants. The union has not filed any document to show that there is any written conditions of their service: nor have they filed their letters of appointment to indicate that there was an express stipulation governing their duty hours: and, the Standing Orders Ext. M-17 also do not contain any order regulating duty hours. Section 9A of the Act appears to have no application to railway servants, whether they belong to the Indian Railways or to Railway companies. Section 9A itself says that no notice shall be required for effecting any such change in respect of item 4 of the Fourth Schedule where the workmen likely to be affected by the change are persons to whom any other rule and regulation that may be notified in this behalf by the appropriate Government in the Official Gazette, apply. The Railway Servants (Hours of Employment) Rules are rules in this category, to which Section 9A has no application. I am, therefore, of the view that the Railway Company was entitled to reclassify the employment of all its railway servants from continuous to essentially intermittent without compliance with Section 9A of the Act. It was held in May and Baker (India) Limited Vs. Their workmen, 1961 (II) LLJ 94 and in Workmen of Hindustan Shipyard (P) Limited Vs. Industrial Tribunal, 1961 (II) LLJ 526 that an employer has the power to vary the working hours within statutory limits; and this is what has been done, in the instant case, by the Railway Company also. To the same effect is the decision in the Oil and Natural Gas Commission Vs. the Workmen, AIR 1973 SC 968. One has only to substitute the phrase "classification of employment" for the phrase "working hours".

16. The above discussion will show that the two declarations issued by the Railway Company do not create any industrial dispute, even though they may be disputed by the union, because the Act has no application at all. The Tribunal is, therefore, precluded from going into that question and, for that matter, into the further questions whether they were not issued by the prescribed authority, whether they are the result of malafides, whether they amount to unfair labour practice, whether they were for a prolonged period or purely as a temporary measure, and whether there was any emergency or not. The Tribunal will have no jurisdiction to go into these matters for several reasons. Firstly, the dispute being not an industrial dispute, the Tribunal has no power to decide these matters. Secondly, if there was malafides if there was unfair labour practice, if there was no temporary measure, if there was no emergency, if the declarations had not been made by the prescribed authority, if they were bad for any other analogous reasons, all these questions should have been raised by the union before the Regional Labour Commissioner who was the only authority statutorily competent to entertain, hear and decide these points: and whose decision, the law says, would be final, unless an appeal was made to the Government. All these matters are foreign to the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. It is a case where the remedy open to the union was not availed of, and the remedy not open to it, is being pressed in service.

17. However, all these matters were argued at great length by both sides, and if I may say so, with great vehemence and fervour, and therefore, I wish to say a few words on merits also. The two declarations were issued by the Traffic Manager. The learned counsel for the union argued that the Traffic Manager was not a senior scale officer and, therefore, he had not the power to issue these declarations. No such plea was raised expressly, or even by implication.

in the rejoinder. The Railway Company cannot be allowed to be taken by surprise during the course of arguments. Had the plea been raised, it would have been forewarned and might have taken necessary steps to file the gradation list to show that the Traffic Manager was a senior scale officer. In the evidence, Phulendra Prasad, MW-2 deposed that the Secretary of the Railway Company is the Head of the Railway Administration, whereas A. Kumar, the Traffic Manager, is the head of the Traffic department, and is second only to the Head of the railway Company. He further stated that the scale of pay of the Traffic Manager is Rs. 1800—2500, besides certain other perquisites. The Central Pay Commission's Report shows that a scale of Rs. 1800 to 2500 is a senior scale. There is, therefore, no merit in this contention. The first declaration lasted during the period January 25, 1974 to February 13, 1974 and the second declaration applied to the period January 30, 1974 to February 13, 1974, vide Ext. W-1, W-2 and M-9. The first one had a duration of 20 days and the second one a duration of 15 days. One cannot, therefore, designate these short durations as prolonged: they are obviously temporary in nature. The question of malafides and emergency are interlinked and hinge upon the same evidence. It is not disputed that even before the issue of these two declarations, there were two Station Masters and one Pointsman in the "excluded" category, and one Assistant Station Master and thirty-six Pointsmen in the "essentially intermittent" category. It is only the rest that were declared to be in "essentially intermittent" employment by changing their classification from the category of "continuous" employment. This was done, plainly, to my mind, when the Railway Company was faced with an emergency. There is a complex of industries, collectively called Rohtas Industries at Dalmianagar. Its subsidiary industries are paper, cement, chemicals, Vanaspati etc. In addition to Rohtas Industries, there is another cement factory called the Ashoka Cement Limited. The Rohtas Industries Cement Factory and the Ashoka Cement Limited between themselves consume about 2000 tonnes of limestone as raw material and produce about 12,50 tonnes of cement per day, a fact which has not been denied by the union which fell satisfied by stating in its rejoinder that it has no comments to offer. The General Secretary of the Dalmianagar Mazdoor Sewa Sangh served a strike notice upon the Rohtas Industries and Ashoka Cement Limited on December 11, 1973 of their intention to go on strike. The Joint Secretary of the Dalmianagar Mazdoor Union served a similar notice upon Rohtas Industries and Ashoka Cement Limited on December 31, 1973. The above will appear from Ext. M-1 and M-2. Ext. M-3 is a charter of their demands. The Government of Bihar even prohibited the staging of the strike under Rule 119 of the Defence of India Rules by notification Ext. M-5 dated February 11, 1974. The Parshva Properties Limited is the sole supplier of limestone to these cement factories from its quarries at Tiura, Pipradih and Rohtas. Due to the strike in the two cement factories, the manufacture of cement came to a halt and affected the quarrying of limestone at Tiura, Pipradih and Rohtas, with the result that Parshva Properties Limited laid-off its workers from January 28, 1974 as there was no stocking place left at the site of the quarries. Ext. M-12 is a chart showing movement of Goods Trains during the period January 14, 1974 to February 13, 1974. Before the declarations, 35 Goods Trains ran during the period January 14 to January 24, just preceding the date of the first declaration, giving an average of 3.5 Goods Trains per day. January 14 to January 24 is a part of the period of strike in the two cement factories. Only 21 Goods Trains ran during January 25 to February 13 during which the two declarations were in force, giving an average of one Goods Train per day. On January 25, 27 and 28 three such trains ran; On January 26 and February 2 only two such trains ran; On January 29, 30, 31st and February 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 only one Goods Train ran, and on February 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 no Goods Trains were at all run. Before the period of strike, during the period of normalcy, 8 pairs of goods trains used to cover the route daily. It is not difficult to imagine, therefore that during the period of strike, there was not much custom to carry. Ext. M-13 shows that in the year 1971 limestone carried was 6,65,883 tonnes as against other goods to the extent of 1,10,443 tonnes; in the year 1972 the limestone carried was 6,75,641 and other goods 1,03,302 respectively in the year 1973 the tonnage was 5,58,856 and 54,884 respectively; and in the year 1974 the tonnage upto August 5, 1974 was 48,383 and 8,413 respectively. The income during the four years upto August 5, 1974 was Rs. 55,82,707; Rs. 56,25,602, 56,08,964 and 5,36,201 respectively. Ext. M-14 shows that limestone carried during January 1974 was 32,661 tonnes as against other goods to the extent of

7,028 tonnes. Ext. M-15 is a statement showing the duties of Pointsman during the period when the two declarations were in force. Ext. M-16 is another statement showing the duties of Station Masters/Assistant Station Masters during the same period. It is worthy of note that even though the two cement factories stopped manufacturing cement with effect from January 13 when the workmen of these two factories went on strike, the Railway Company did not classify the employment of its servants with effect from that date but waited from January 13 to January 24 for a full period of 12 days, and then alone issued the first declaration and it is only when Parshva Properties Limited stopped quarrying on January 27 when the company issued the second declaration on January 30. It does not appear to have been the intention of the Railway Company to act by way of malafides merely to take more work from its servants. The raw material depleted and then disappeared and there was little the Railway Company could carry. Its funds started dwindling and it had to lay-off some of its employees and take more work from the depleted strength of the staff by re-classifying their employment. It does not follow as a matter of fact that the Railway servants had actually to work overtime merely because they were made to work for 12 hours instead of 8. The work load was not the same, and indeed, much less, because of the curtailment in Goods Train service. The period of 12 hours compressed periods of activity and periods of in-action because either no trains were running or very few were on the run. In the circumstance it is not possible to hold that the declarations were the result of malafides, or there was no emergency. There can be no question of unfair labour practices also when the declarations were made in the circumstances above mentioned. There was no victimisation etc. The old classification was revived of Feb. 14 when the strike were stopped. However, as stated earlier, these questions do not fall for determination before the Tribunal in view of the fact that the Tribunal has no jurisdiction over them.

18. The next contention is that there was in existence a binding settlement between the parties which was still in operation and, therefore, the declarations could not be made so as to infringe the settlement. There is no substance in this contention also. The tenability of the point is not open to the decision of the Tribunal. It could have been pleaded before the Regional Labour Commissioner but as stated earlier, the declarations, in so far as the Tribunal is concerned, are final and sacrosanct and cannot be touched. It appears that the recognised union had served a notice of strike on the Railway Company on 4/5th March, 1970 and had also submitted a charter of demands on May 26, 1969. As a result of this, mutual negotiations took place between the two and there came into existence a settlement which was to be effective from April 1, 1970. One of the terms of the settlement was that the Railway Company would employ 12 Pointsman to change over the duty hours from essentially intermittent to continuous with regard to five Railway Stations. This settlement is Ext. W-4. It was arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceedings Section 2(p) read with Rule 58 of the Central Rules required the settlement to be signed by the parties thereto in such manner as has been prescribed and a copy thereto has to be sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the Conciliation Officer. I may take it that the settlement is in Form 'H' as it is in substantial compliance with that form, and I may further take it that it was sent to the appropriate authority. Under sub-section (1) of Section 18, a settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and the workmen otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement, and not on those who are not parties to it. The settlement had been entered into between the Railway Company and the recognised union and not by the union and, therefore, the union cannot take advantage of it. Besides clause (b) of Demand No. 34 in the settlement says that both the parties agree that during the pendency of this agreement, the employees shall not raise any general demand involving financial obligations. The union has raised such a demand by claiming for payment of overtime. Clause (a) of Demand No. 34 mentions that the agreement is a composite settlement and no party can have the benefit of one term to the exclusion of any other term and if any party seeks to do so, it is open to the other party to treat itself automatically free from the entire agreement. In the circumstance, therefore, for the reasons stated above, the settlement does not come into the picture at all. Moreover no contract come override a statute, as it will be violative of Public policy.

19. The last contention of the learned council for the Railway Company is that the reference itself is bad on twin grounds, namely (1) that the Government had no material before it on which it could base its opinion that there was in existence an industrial dispute and (2) that the dispute referred is in respect of the justification or otherwise of change in the working hours whereas it should have been whether Section 9A of the Act was applicable or not to the Railway Company in view of Section 71A, Section 71-E and Rule 3 made under Section 71-E of the Railways Act. These pleas, to my mind, are too technical to require any consideration and particularly so when a Tribunal should not ordinarily embroil itself with more technicalities in the administration of social justice. It may be that the order of reference as framed is a little ambiguous, and calls for a probing into the actual dispute in order to find out what exactly was referred to the Tribunal. It is well-settled that when a dispute arises as to the exact scope of the question referred, it is open to the Tribunal to look into the claim petitions and the statements filed before it in order to understand what was the exact dispute that was sought to be referred. The pleas clearly show that the real dispute is as to whether the Railway Company had or had not the power to classify the employment of its servants, without due compliance with the mandatory provisions of Section 9A. Both the parties know their positions in the matter, and on that basis they filed their respective written statement and rejoinders, and not only that, but adduced evidence in support of their respective contentions and also raised arguments in that regard. I, therefore, reject this contention of the Railway Company.

20. In view of the totality of my findings, the action of the Railway Company in classifying the employment of Station Masters/Assistant Station Masters/Pointsmen involving the enhancement of the duty hours from 8 to 12, is legal and justified; and that being so the workmen are not entitled to any relief.

Sd/-.

K. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-41012/10/74/LR JII/D II(B)]
HARBANS BAHADUR, Section Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 1976

कांग्रेस 2724—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री पी.०.टी. शिवपकाशम् को उक्त अधिनियम और उसके प्रधीन विवरित स्कीम और कुटुम्ब पेशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल थोक या निर्यात उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्यों में विभाग या शाखाएँ हो, समूर्ण महाराष्ट्र राज्य के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12016(9)/75-पी०एफ० I]

New Delhi, the 7th July, 1976

S.O. 2724.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. T. Sivaprasam to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A-12016(9)/75-PF.I]

कांग्रेस 2725.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत सरकार के

भविष्य अम, गोजगां और पुनर्गी मवालय (अम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिकृतना संघा कांग्रेस 3753 तारीख 26 अक्टूबर, 1968 को, जहां तक इसका सवन्ध श्रीमती ए. पी. सुक्तांकर से है, विवरित करती है।

[संख्या 20(65)/64-पी०एफ० I]

S.O. 2725.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby rescinds the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 3753 dated the 26th October, 1968 so far as it relates to Shrimati A. B. Sukthankar.

[No. 20(65)/64-PF.I]

कांग्रेस 2726—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री पी.०.टी. मोरे को उक्त अधिनियम और उसके प्रधीन विवरित स्कीम और कुटुम्ब पेशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल थोक या निर्यात उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्यों में विभाग या शाखाएँ हो, समूर्ण महाराष्ट्र राज्य के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12016(2)/75-पी०एफ० I]

S.O. 2726.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri M. V. More to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Maharashtra for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A-12016(2)/75-PF.I]

कांग्रेस 2727—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री पी.०.के० तालेगांवकर की उक्त अधिनियम, स्कीम और उसके प्रधीन विवरित कुटुम्ब पेशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल थोक या निर्यात उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्यों में विभाग या शाखाएँ हो, समूर्ण गुजरात राज्य के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12016(9)/75-पी०एफ० I(i)]

S.O. 2727.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri M. K. Talegaonkar to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Gujarat for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of, the Central Government, or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry, or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A-12016(9)/75-PF.I(i)]

का० २७२८ २७२८—गर्भवारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेशन निधि प्रधिनियम, १९५२ (१९५२ का १९) की धारा १३ की उपधारा (१) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एन० जी० देसाई की उक्त प्रधिनियम, स्कीम और उसके अधीन विरचित किसी कुटुम्ब पेशन के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कंपनी, महापालन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियन्त्रित उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी दूसरे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्य में विभाग या शाखाएं हों, सम्पूर्ण मध्यराज्य राज्य और गोवा दमण और थीव संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-१२०१६(१७)/७३-वी०एफ० १]

S.O. 2728.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri N. G. Desai to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Maharashtra and the Union territory of Goa, Daman and Diu for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of, the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry, or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A 12016(17)/73-PF. I]

नई दिल्ली, ८ जुलाई, १९७६

का० २७२९—गर्भवारी भविष्य निधि प्रधिनियम, १९५२ (१९५२ का १९) की धारा १३ की उपधारा (१) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम मन्त्रालय की प्रधिमूलना संस्था का० आ० ७११ तारीख १ मार्च, १९७४ को, अधिकारी करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री पी० एम० धोतरेकर को उक्त प्रधिनियम, स्कीम और उसके अधीन विरचित कुटुम्ब पेशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कंपनी, महापालन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियन्त्रित उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी दूसरे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्य में विभाग या शाखाएं हों। सम्पूर्ण बिहार राज्य के लिये निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-१२०१६(१५)/७३-वी०एफ० १(ii)]

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1976

S.O. 2729.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 711 dated the 1st March, 1974, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. S. Dhotrekar to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Bihar for the purposes of the said Act, the scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry, or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A. 12016 (15)/73-PF.I(ii)]

नई दिल्ली, ९ जुलाई, १९७६

का० २७३०—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा प्रधिनियम, १९४८ (१९४८ का ३४) की धारा ८७ द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों।

का प्रयोग करते हुए, और भारत सरकार के श्रम मन्त्रालय की प्रधिमूलना संस्था का० २९६८ तारीख २१-८-१९७५ के अनुक्रम से 'व इडियन ग्रायल कारपोरेशन लि० (विपणन खण्ड) आरामपुर, कानपुर-९ को उक्त प्रधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से ४ अप्रैल, १९७६ से ३ अप्रैल, १९७७ तक (जिसमें वह विन भी सम्मिलित है) एक वर्ष की अवधि के दूर देती है।

२. पूर्वोक्त दूर की शर्तें निम्नलिखित हैं, अर्थात् :—

(1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक, उस प्रवधि की बाबत जिसके द्वारा उस कारखाने पर उक्त प्रधिनियम प्रवर्तनान था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् 'उक्त प्रवधि' कहा गया है), ऐसी विवरणियों, ऐसे प्रलैप में और ऐसी विविधियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, १९५० के अधीन उसे उक्त प्रवधि की बाबत देनी थी,

(2) नियम द्वारा उक्त प्रधिनियम भी धारा ४५ की उपधारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त कि या गया कोई निरीक्षक या निगम का इस नियमित प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य पदधारी—

(i) धारा ४५ की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त प्रवधि की बाबत वी गई किसी विवरणी की विविधियों को सत्यापित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ; या

(ii) यह प्रधिनियिक्त करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, १९५० द्वारा यथाप्रपेक्षित रजिस्टर और प्रधिकृत, उक्त प्रवधि के लिये रखे गए थे या नहीं; या

(iii) यह प्रधिनियिक्त करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा दिये गये उन कार्यों को, जिसके पश्चात्कल इस प्रधिमूलना के अधीन दूर वी जा रही है, नकद में और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हफदार बना हुआ है या नहीं; या

(iv) यह प्रधिनियिक्त करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस प्रवधि के द्वारा, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में प्रधिनियम के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त हो, ऐसे किसी उपबन्धों का प्रत्युपालन किया गया था या नहीं;

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिये समर्पित होगा।—

(क) प्रधान या प्रध्यवहित नियोजक से प्रोफेक्शन करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी आवश्यक समझती है; या

(ख) ऐसे प्रधान या प्रध्यवहित नियोजक के प्रधिभूगाधीन किसी कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उपित्त समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वे व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और भजदूरी के संबंध से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहिर्या और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करे और उनकी परीक्षा करने वे, या उन्हें ऐसा जानकारी दे जिसे वे प्रावश्यक समझते हैं; या

(ग) प्रधान या प्रध्यवहित नियोजक की, उसके अधिकर्ता या सेवक की, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में पाया जाये, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास वह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि वह कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना; या

(ज) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे किसी रजिस्टर, लेखांकनी या अन्य वस्ताविज की नकल तैयार करना या उससे उद्धरण लेना।

व्याख्यात्मक जापन

इस भास्त्र में पूर्वाधीशी प्रभाव से छूट देनी प्रावधानक हो गई है क्योंकि छूट के नवीकरण के लिये अपेक्षित सूचना देर से मिली थी। तथापि, यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि जिन परिस्थितियों में कारखाने को प्रारम्भ में छूट स्वीकृत की गई थी वे अभी भी विद्यमान हैं और कारखाना छूट का पात्र है। यह भी प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि पूर्वाधीशी प्रभाव से छूट की स्वीकृति किसी के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं डालेगी।

[संख्या एस-38017/8/74-ए० आई०]

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1976

S.O. 2730.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 2968 dated the 21st August, 1975 the Central Government hereby exempts the Indian Oil Corporation Limited (Marketing Division) Arampore, Kanpur-9 from the operation of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the 4th April, 1976 upto and inclusive of the 3rd April, 1977.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;

(2) Any inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act, or other Official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of—

- (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) or section 44 for the said period; or
- (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
- (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification, or
- (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act had been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory; be empowered to—
 - (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
 - (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in charge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
 - (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant, or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or

(d) make copies of or take extracts from, any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case, as the required information for renewal of exemption was received late. However, it is certified that the conditions under which the factory was initially granted exemption still persist and the factory is eligible for exemption. It is also certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of anybody adversely.

[No. S-38017/8/74-HI]

नई दिल्ली, 12 जून 1976

का० आ० 2731.—यह: मेघालय राज्य सरकार से कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के खण्ड (प) के अनुसरण में श्री जे० सी० नामपुरी के स्थान पर श्री एस० मारवेइन सचिव, मेघालय सरकार अम विभाग, शिलांग को कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम में उस राज्य का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिये नामनिविष्ट किया है;

प्रतः, मम, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 4 के प्रनुसारण में भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना संघर्षा का० आ० 1517, सारीख 14 प्रैल, 1976 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “(राज्य सरकारों द्वारा धारा 4 के खण्ड (प) के प्रधीन नामनिविष्ट)” सौर्खक के नीचे मदद 19 के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जायेगी, अर्थात् :—

श्री एस० मारवेइन,
सचिव,
मेघालय सरकार,
अम विभाग, शिलांग।

[संख्या पू-160125/76-एच०आई०]
एस० एम० महसूनामन, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th July, 1976

S.O. 2731.—Whereas the State Government of Meghalaya has, in pursuance of clause (d) of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) nominated Shri S. Marwein, Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya, Labour Department, Shillong, to represent that State on the Employees' State Insurance Corporation in place of Shri J. C. Nampui.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1517, dated the 14th April, 1976, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading “(nominated by the State Governments under clause (d) of section 4)”, for the entry against item 19, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

Shri S. Marwein,
Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya,
Labour Department, Shillong.

[No. U-16012/5/76-HI]
S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 9th July, 1976

S.O. 2732.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government

hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th July, 1976.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
AT CALCUTTA**

Reference No. 59 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank,

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Employers—Sri G. D. Maheswari, Law Officer, Personnel.

On behalf of Workmen—Sri A. D. Singh, President, Allahabad Bank Cash Staff Association.

State : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Banking

AWARD

By Order No. L. 12012/97/75/DII/A dated 6th September, 1975, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank and their workmen, to this tribunal for adjudication. The reference reads as :

"Whether the claim of Sri Deep Chand Kapoor for posting as Head Cashier at the Burrabazar Branch of the Allahabad Bank is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workmen entitled?

2. Claim for special allowance by the bank employees was settled under the Settlement dated 19-10-1966 between the bank managements and their workmen. Paragraph 5.2 of the aforesaid settlement provides the special allowance payable to Asstt. Head Cashiers upto Head-Cashiers in Category E (they are enumerated as items xii to xviii in Part I under Paragraph 5.2 referred to above). The amount of the allowance had been increased in each of these cases under the later settlement dated 12-10-1970. Sri Deep Chand Kapoor was a Head Cashier of Category A at Bhowanipur branch of Allahabad Bank in Calcutta in 1972, when he was drawing an allowance of Rs. 33/- per mensem. This was so because there was only a unit of 4 clerks. Under A category if the unit was of 5 clerks and above the allowance would be Rs. 43/- in the same category. On behalf of Sri Kapoor it was contended that a vacancy of a Head-Cashier who was to be paid Rs. 43 as allowance occurred in Burrabazar branch of the Bank on 1-8-1972; but he was not appointed to that vacancy. On the other hand, it is contended that the management did not fill up that vacancy until 18-7-1973 and later one Nanak Chandra Khetri was appointed to that vacancy with effect from 18-7-1973. And on behalf of Sri Kapoor it was contended that he would be entitled to be appointed to the post of Head Cashier of Burrabazar branch with effect from 1-8-1972 getting an allowance of Rs. 43/- per mensem.

3. It is relevant to point out that the seniority inter se among the staff of the Bank was determined as per the Rules mentioned in Ext. M-2. The special allowance of the bank cashiers was determined under a separate agreement, Ext. M-1 dated 22-9-1973 by which the category of cashiers were classified as category A, Category B, Category C, and Category E depending upon the quantity of the money deposit of each branch. Category B is not applicable to this case. Branch comes under this category A if the deposit is less than Rs. 50 lakhs; it comes under Category C if the deposit is above Rs. 50 lakhs; it comes under Category E if the deposit is One crore of rupees and above. The cashiers will get Rs. 33, Rs. 55 and Rs. 85 respectively in each of these banks. After Ext. M-1 agreement came into force Shri

Kapoor was appointed at Bhowanipore branch with an allowance of Rs. 85 with effect from 29-11-1973. At that time he was already acting on an special allowance of Rs. 55/- with effect from 31-10-1973 at the same office. It is also relevant to point out that he was paid the proportionate amount of special allowance with effect from 21-10-73 since Shri Khetri had also been promoted to category E with effect from 21-10-1973. So Shri Kapoor had no complaint with regard to his allowance. He had drawn at the rate of Rs. 85/- per mensem with effect from 21-10-1973. Between him and Shri Khetri there could be no dispute with regard to the payment of special allowance from 21-10-1973. Both of them got the same rate of allowance under Category E Head Cashier.

4. However, the dispute centres round the question whether Shri Kapoor would be entitled as of right to claim a transfer to Burra Bazar branch with effect from 1-8-1972 or at least to reimburse him special allowance at the rate of Rs. 43/- from 1-8-1972 to 21-10-1973. First of all the Union or the workman concerned did not produce any evidence to show that the management withheld the posting of any Head cashier at Burra Bazar branch with effect from 1-8-1972 and until 18-7-1973, when the vacancy was offered to Shri Khetri. In the absence of any evidence the right to keep open the vacancy at Burra Bazar branch from 1-8-1972 to 18-7-1973 appears to be a managerial right, which cannot be questioned. It is for the management to decide to fill up the vacancy or keep it vacant. It would depend upon several factors which the management alone could decide. So, Shri Kapoor could not claim as matter of right any transfer to Burra Bazar branch with effect from 1-8-1972, much less to claim the relative special allowance for the period ending with 18-7-1973.

5. The next question is whether Shri Kapoor could be paid the allowance at the rate of Rs. 43/- per mensem from 18-7-73 to 21-10-1973. It is admitted that there are other employees who are senior to Shri Kapoor in the Head Head Cashiers' posts and as such Shri Kapoor could not claim any preference over Shri Khetri. It is also stated that Shri Khetri is senior to Shri Kapoor. There is no rule that an Asstt. Cashier could not be placed in charge of the work of A category Head Cashier. It is not a cadre promotion. The Tribunal can interfere only if there is discrimination interse between two employees in the matter of selection for payment of special allowance. The dispute has never been between Shri Kapoor and Shri Khetri for identical post of Head Cashier. If that be so, Shri Kapoor would not have been a rival to Shri Khetri since there were other employees declared to be senior to Shri Kapoor. Shri Kapoor, therefore, could not establish any discrimination much less any injustice in this case. There is no basis in his claim for transfer or for special allowance.

6. In the result, the Reference is answered against the workman. An Award is passed accordingly.

[No. L. 12012/97/75/D.II(A)]

Dated, Calcutta,
The 29th June, 1976.

E. K. MOIDU, Presiding Officer

S.O. 2733.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 2nd July, 1976.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR
(M.P.)**

PRESENT :

SHRI S. N. JOHRI, M.Sc., LL.M. —Presiding Officer.

Case No. CGIT/LC(R) (7) of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Indore and their workmen represented through the General Secretary, State Bank of Indore, Karamchari Sangh, 30, Bakshi Gali, Indore (M.P.)

APPEARANCES :

For workmen—None

For employers—None.

INDUSTRY : Bank

DISTRICT : Indore (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated : June 26, 1976

Government of India in the Labour Department referred the following industrial dispute for the adjudication by this Tribunal vide their Order No. L-12012/93/74-LR. III-DII(A) dated 10th February, 1975 :—

"Whether the demand of the State Bank of the Indore Karamchari Sangh, Indore, that Shri Mohan Gangaram, Cash Peon, Prince Yeshwant Road Branch of the State Bank of Indore should be paid the cash peon allowance for the period from the 1st February, 1972 to the 8th August, 1972 is justified ? If so, to what relief is he entitled ?"

2. The parties have entered into a settlement and have sent a memorandum of settlement signed by both the parties and the workmen concerned. It has been stated therein that the amount of claim has been paid by the management and prayed that in view of the above settlement a no dispute award be given. The award is given accordingly. The settlement petition shall form part of the award.

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-12012/93/74-LR III]

R. KUNJITHAPADAM, Under Secy.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, 724 NAPIER TOWN.
JABALPUR (M.P.)

I. D. No. CGIT/LC (R) (7)/75

In the matter of Industrial Dispute

BETWEEN

The Management of State Bank of Indore, Head Office,
5 Yeshwant Niwas Road, Indore

AND

Its workmen : Shri Mohan Gangaram, Cash Peon,
B. O. P. Y. Road, Indore as represented by State
Bank of Indore Karamchari Sangh, 30, Bakshi Gali,
Indore.

It is submitted :—

1. That as the amount of claim has been paid by the Management, no dispute in this regard exists.

2. That in view of the above, this Hon'ble Tribunal is prayed to pass 'No Dispute' Award.

Sd/- Illegible.

23-6-1976.

Indore

Dated the 23rd June, 1976.

30, Bakshi Gali, Indore.

Accepted.

Sd/- Mohan (In Hindi)

(Mohan Gangaram)

Cash Peon,

State Bank of Indore,

B. O. P. Y. Road, Indore.

PART OF AWARD

S. N. JOHRI, Presiding Officer
26-6-1976

नई दिल्ली, 12, जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2734—ज्ञान प्रधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, सर्वश्री दशरथसिंह और राजा राम को मुख्य ज्ञान निरीक्षक के मात्रहृत ज्ञान निरीक्षक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फाइल संख्या ए-12025(5/74-एम-1) (ii)

जे० सी० सक्सेना, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th July, 1976

S.O. 2734.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952, (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints S/Shri Dasharath Singh and Raja Ram as Inspector of Mines subordinate to the Chief Inspector of Mines.

[No. A-12025/5/74-M. I(ii)]
J. C. SAXENA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1976

S.O. 2735.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Dharmaband Colliery of M/s. BCC Ltd, P. O. Malkera, Distt. Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5-7-76.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 4 of 1975

(Ministry's Order No. L-2012/95/74-LRII, Dt. 31-1-1975)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Dharmaband Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Malkera, Dist. Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

For the Workmen—None.

State : Bihar.

Industry : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 1st July, 1976

AWARD

The Central Government, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"Is the action of the management of Dharmaband Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Malkera, District Dhanbad in refusing to allow Shri Chhutu Mian, Miner to resume his duty with effect from the 20th June, 1973 justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The reference was made on January 31, 1975, but some three and a half months earlier, on October 10, 1974 to be precise, Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited and the Vice President, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union, had patched up their differences on the basis of a mutual settlement (Annexure I). They filed Annexure-I before the Tribunal on June 28, 1976 along with a joint petition praying that the Tribunal should give its award in terms of Annexure-I. The joint petition states that the settlement arrived at between them, has already been implemented also, and no matter is any longer in dispute.

3. In these circumstances, the award is given in terms of the settlement (Annexure I), which shall form part of the award.

K. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer
[F. No. L-2012/95/74-LR II/D III A]
S. H. S. IYER, Section Officer.

ANNEXURE-I

Memorandum of settlement arrived at between the Sub-Area Manager for the Management of Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Dharmaband Sub-Area-IV and the Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union over alleged illegal and arbitrary refusal of work to Sri Chhutu Mian, Miner of Dharmaband Colliery from 20-6-74.

The Vice-President, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union raised an Industrial Dispute before the A.L.C. (C) regarding alleged illegal and arbitrary refusal of work to Sri Chhutu Mian, Miner from 20-6-74. The conciliation ended in a failure. After some time Sri Rajnandan Singh again represented to reconsider the employment of Sri Chhutu Mian. After long discussion between the Union and the Sub-Area Manager, the dispute was mutually settled.

TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT

1. It was agreed that Sri Chhutu Mian would be given employment in Dharmaband Colliery in his original job from the day he reports for duty.

2. That Sir Chhutu Mian would report for his duties immediately but not later than 19th October, 1974.

3. That the period from 20-6-74 till the date of resumption of his duties would be treated as leave without pay.

Signature of the representative
of the Workmen.

Signature of the
representative
of the Management.

1. Sd/- Rajnandan Singh
2. Sd/- ILLEGIBLE

Secretary, Bihar
Colliery Kamgar Union

1. S. M. Koley, SAM
2.

WITNESSES:—

1. Sd/- S. S. Mitra
2. Sd/- Haroo Bouri

दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण

सर्वजनिक सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 24 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2736.—दिल्ली ईर्ष्यमैट एक्ट, 1957 की धारा 11 (1957 की सं० 61) के अन्तर्गत सूचना :

एतद्वारा सूचना दी जाती है कि :—

(ए) केन्द्रीय सरकार ने दिल्ली ईर्ष्यमैट एक्ट, 1957 (1957 की सं० 61) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (2) के अन्तर्गत जोन सी-14 (तिमार पुर), सी-15 (किंग्सवे कॉम्प) तथा सी-19 (माडल टाउन) के जोनल ईर्ष्यमैट प्लान को स्वीकृति प्रदान कर दी है।

(बी) समस्त कार्यशील दिनों में प्रातः 11.00 बजे से अपराह्न 3.00 बजे तक दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के कार्यालय, विकास भीनार, प्याराहर्षी भविल, मुख्य योजना अनुभाग, इन्द्रप्रस्थ इस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-1 में आकर स्वीकृत योजना चित्र का निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

[सं० एक० 4(30)166-एम०पी०]

दृष्टव्य नाम फोटोदार, सचिव

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

PUBLIC NOTICE

New Delhi, the 24th July, 1976

S.O. 2736.—Notice under Section 11 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (No. 61 of 1957):

Notice is hereby given that :—

(a) The Central Government have, under Sub-section (2) of Section 9 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (No. 61 of 1957), approved the zonal development plan for zones C-14 (Timarpur), C-15 (Kingsway Camp) and C-19 (Model Town).

(b) A copy of the plan as approved may be inspected at the office of the Delhi Development Authority, Vikas Minar, 11th Floor, Master Plan Section, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi-110001, between the hours of 11.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m. on all working days.

[No. F. 4 (30)/66-MP]
H. N. FOTEDAR, Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और वित्त विभाग

(राजस्व पक्ष)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 17 जुलाई, 1976

स्टाम्प

का० आ० 2737.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का

2) का धारा 9 को उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ज) द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार महाराष्ट्र राज्य वित्तीय नियम, मुम्बई को, उक्त नियम द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले एक करोड़ पैसठ लाख रुपए अंकित मूल्य के डिब्बेकरों के रूप में बन्धपत्रों पर स्टाम्प शुल्क मद्दे प्रभाव्य एक लाख तेरहस छाजार सात सौ पचास रुपये मात्र समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क का संवाध करने की मनूषा देती है।

[सं० 35/76-स्टाम्प/फा० सं० 471/40/76-सीमाशुल्क-II]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Revenue & Banking)
(Revenue Wing)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th July, 1976

STAMPS

S.O. 2737.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Maharashtra State Financial Corporation, Bombay, to pay consolidated stamp duty of one lakh, twenty-three thousand seven hundred and fifty rupees only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on bonds in the form of debentures of the face value of one crore and sixty-five lakhs of rupees issued by the said Corporation.

[No. 35/76-Stamp—F. No. 471/40/76-Cus. VII]

आदेश

का० आ० 2738—मारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 का उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त विक्रियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, महाराष्ट्र शैक्षणिक विकास निगम, मुंबई को, उक्त निगम द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले तीन करोड़ पचासी लाख रुपए अंकित मूल्य के विवेचनों के रूप में बन्धपत्र पर स्टाम्प शुल्क भद्र प्रभारी दो लाख रुपाएँ रुजार सात सौ पचास रुपये मात्र समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क का संदर्भ करने का अनुज्ञा देती है।

[सं० 36/76-स्टाम्प—का० सं० 471/41/76-सीमायुक्त-VII]

ओ० पी० मेहरा, उप सचिव

ORDER

S.O. 2738—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Maharashtra Industrial Development Corporation, Bombay, to pay consolidated stamp duty of two lakhs, eighty-eight thousand seven hundred and fifty rupees only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on bonds in the form of debentures of the face value of three crores, eighty-five lakhs of rupees issued by the said Corporation.

[No. 36/76-Stamp—F. No. 471/41/76-Cus. VII]

O. P. MEHRA, Dy. Secy.

निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 1976

का० आ० 2739.—राष्ट्रपति, मूल नियमों के नियम 45 के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, सरकारी निवास स्थान आवंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) नियम, 1963 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, प्रर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम सरकारी निवास स्थान आवंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) तृतीय संशोधन नियम, 1976 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।
50 GI/76-6

2. सरकारी निवास स्थान आवंटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) नियम, 1963 में, अनुप्रकृत नियम 317-ख-8 में,—

(क) उप नियम (1) में,

(1) खण्ड (i) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित खण्ड रखा जाएगा, प्रर्थात्:—

“(i) महिला अधिकारियों का पूल, विवाहित महिला अधिकारियों और विवाहित महिला अधिकारियों के लिए पृथक्-पृथक्; और;”

(ii) निम्नलिखित स्पष्टीकरण अन्त में जोड़ा जाएगा, प्रर्थात्:—

स्पष्टीकरण—खण्ड (i) में,—

(क) “विवाहित महिला अधिकारी” से ऐसी महिला अधिकारी अभिप्रेत है, जिसका विवाह अस्तित्व में है और जो अपने पति से न्यायिक रूप से पृथक नहीं हुई है;

(ब) “विवाहित महिला अधिकारी” से ऐसी महिला अधिकारी अभिप्रेत है, जो विवाहित महिला अधिकारी नहीं है।

[का० सं० 12033(4)/76-नीति-II]

MINISTRY OF WORKS & HOUSING

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1976

S.O. 2739.—In pursuance of the provisions of rule 45 of the Fundamental Rules, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Third Amendment Rules, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, in Supplementary Rule 317-B-8,—

(a) in sub-rule (1),—

(i) for clause (i), the following clause shall be substituted, namely:—

“(i) Lady Officers Pools separately for married lady officers and for single lady officers; and

(ii) The following Explanation shall be inserted at the end, namely:—

“EXPLANATION : In clause (i),—

(a) “married lady officer” means a lady officer whose marriage is subsisting and who is not judicially separated from her husband;

(b) “Single lady officer” means a lady officer who is not a married lady officer.”

(b) in sub-rule (4), in clause (a), for the words “Lady Officers Pool”, the words “Lady Officers Pools” shall be substituted.

[F. No. 12033 (4)/76-Pol. II]

का० अ० 2740--राष्ट्रपति, मूल नियमों के नियम 45 के उपर्यन्तों के अनुसरण में, सरकारी निवास स्थान आवटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) नियम, 1963 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अबातुः--

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम सरकारी निवास स्थान आवटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) चतुर्थ संशोधन नियम, 1976 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन का तारीख को प्रवृत्त होने।

2. सरकारी निवास स्थान आवटन (दिल्ली में साधारण पूल) नियम, 1963 में, अनुप्रयोग नियम 317-B-20 में, उपनियम (2) के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित उपनियम अन्त स्थापित किया जाएगा, अबातुः--

"(2क) इन नियमों में किसी बात के होते हुए भी,

(क) कोई अधिकारी, जिसके या जिसके कुटुम्ब के किसी सदस्य के स्वामित्वाधीन कोई भवान है, उसे आवटित निवास स्थान या उससे अनुलग्न उपगृह, गरजों या अस्तबलों में से किसी का किसी भी व्यक्ति और साथ सहभोग नहीं करेगा या उसे शिकमी नहीं देगा;

(ख) कोई अधिकारी उसे आवटित निवास स्थान या उससे अनुलग्न उपगृह, गरजों या अस्तबलों में से किसी का ऐसे व्यक्ति के साथ, जिसके या जिसके कुटुम्ब के किसी सदस्य के स्वामित्वाधीन कोई भवान है, सहभोग नहीं करेगा या उसे शिकमी नहीं देगा।

दबावीकरण:-इन उपनियम में "भवान" का वही अर्थ है, जो अनुप्रयोग नियम 317-B-3 में दिया गया है।"

[का० स० 12033(8)/76-नीति II]

सुशुम्भार औषुधी, संयुक्त मणिक

S.O. 2740.—In pursuance of the provisions of rule 45 of the Fundamental Rules, the President hereby makes the following rules, further to amend the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Fourth Amendment Rules, 1976.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Delhi) Rules, 1963, in Supplementary Rule 317-B-20, after sub-rule (2), the following sub-rule shall be inserted, namely :—

"(2A) Notwithstanding anything contained in these rules,—

(a) no officer, who or any member of whose family owns a house, shall share with or sublet to, any person the residence allotted to him or any of the out-houses, garages or stables appurtenant thereto;

(b) no officer shall share with, or sublet to, any person who or any member of whose family owns a house, the residence allotted to such officer or any of the out-houses, garages or stables appurtenant thereto.

EXPLANATION: In this sub-rule "house" shall have the same meaning as in Supplementary Rule 317-B-3".

[F. No. 12033 (8)/76-Pol.II]

S. CHAUDHURY, Joint Secy.